



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 165

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 12, 2019

No. 180

Senate

The Senate met at 3 p.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. GRASSLEY).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Gracious God, our rock of ages in life's shifting sands, give our lawmakers this day the abiding assurance of Your presence.

May they strive to be Your instruments, accomplishing Your will, living by Your power, and being used by You for Your glory. Enable them to experience Your contentment and peace facing life's chaos with quiet hearts and vibrant faith.

Lord, refresh their spirit, quicken their thinking, reinforce their judgment, and empower them to fulfill Your purposes on Earth.

We pray in Your mighty Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. BLACKBURN). Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa is recognized.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I ask permission to speak as in morning business for 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE AMERICAN LEGION

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I come to the floor to recognize the ac-

complishments of an organization that has done great service to communities and veterans across the United States.

This month marks 100 years since the American Legion received its charter from Congress and formally adopted its constitution. When it was established in Paris in March of 1919, the American Legion stated its aims, in part, "to perpetuate the principles of justice, freedom, and democracy for which we have fought."

The accomplishments of the American Legion since that time are numerous and profound. They include successfully lobbying for the creation of what was then called the Veterans Bureau, which would later become the VA, the Department of Veterans Affairs.

The American Legion also conducted pioneering research into PTSD and drafted the original GI bill that helped to educate so many World War II veterans after that war and gave a big boost to the expanding U.S. economy post-World War II.

American Legion members complete 3.7 million hours of community service each year. I happen to be a member of the Sons of the American Legion. As part of that organization, I am blessed to have had the American Legion make a meaningful impact in my life.

When I was a young high school student in Iowa, I was proud to participate in Boys State, where I learned the rights, privileges, and responsibilities of citizenship. The American Legion still does that every year in Iowa and I suppose in every State. Iowans are fortunate to have the enduring presence of the American Legion in our communities.

This August, two Iowans were recognized nationally for their dedication to the American Legion. Bruce Feuerbach of Keystone was elected national vice commander of the American Legion, and Nicole Clapp of Gladbrook was elected national president of the American Legion Auxiliary.

Many more accomplishments are sure to come from the American Legion's Iowa department. I congratulate the American Legion on its 100th year of service and thank all members for their dedication to Iowa and to our Nation.

I want to point out that there was a Major General MacNider, Mason City, IA, who was the fourth national commander of the American Legion and probably one of those who was dedicated to establishing this organization early on.

I yield the floor.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

UNITED STATES-MEXICO-CANADA TRADE AGREEMENT

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I was privileged to spend a good chunk of the day yesterday with the hard-working men and women of North American Stainless in Carroll County, KY. They are a high-quality stainless steel manufacturing firm that is actually the largest fully integrated stainless steel producer in the entire United States.

They produce about one-third of all U.S. stainless. The company brings 1,500 jobs to its rural community that is Kentucky's 8th largest manufacturer by total employment. I joined them yesterday to celebrate an important legislative accomplishment that I was able to spearhead back in July: the long overdue Senate ratification of a bipartisan tax treaty protocol with Spain. By passing this new protocol, we cleared away a mess of confusing and unfair double taxation, the threat of which had stunted growth and investment right here at home.

I got to hear again, firsthand, what a significant difference the approval of

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S6489

this simple bipartisan tax treaty will make for this American manufacturer. I was happy to hear the CEO announce that the company can now move forward with a major \$30 million capital investment in developing its facility and its workforce as a direct result of the ratification of that treaty.

It was just another reminder that the economic policies we vote on here, often on a bipartisan basis, make an enormous difference for workers and job creators in each of our States.

While we applauded the Spain tax treaty and the new prosperity it will unlock, it was impossible to overlook the fact that USMCA is still being blocked over in the House of Representatives. By one analysis, 12 million American jobs are dependent upon trade with Mexico and Canada. Together they make up a \$500 billion market for U.S. exports. It is no surprise that updating our trading relationships with both of our North American neighbors would stand to have a major positive effect on our economy.

To be more specific, according to data from the International Trade Commission, the USMCA would generate about 176,000 new American jobs. It would pump nearly \$70 billion into the U.S. economy, and the already massive markets for U.S. products would be expected to grow by tens of billions more.

For months, Speaker PELOSI and House Democrats have been claiming they notionally support this agreement and want to get to yes, but month after month, this happy talk has seemingly led to no tangible progress, just more heel-dragging. Hard-working Kentuckians, people like our farmers and our cattlemen, keep writing to me and asking Congress to pass the USMCA, but Speaker PELOSI will not make time for it.

House Democrats have enough time to continue their 3-year-old obsession with impeaching the President, but they cannot find the time to pass a landmark trade deal that will create 176,000 new American jobs. Just saying their priorities out loud indicates how backward they are.

HONG KONG

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, now, on a totally different matter, Hong Kong has been rocked by more violence as citizens continue resisting the Chinese Communist Party's encroachment on their autonomy and freedoms.

On Monday, it appears the local police shot a 21-year-old protester at nearly point-blank range. The police have arrested hundreds of demonstrators, reportedly as young as 12 and as old as 82. Tear gas, rubber bullets, and other violent measures have now become standard fare.

A few days earlier, a number of democracy-supporting Hong Kong legislators were swept up in a government crackdown. These elected officials were

either arrested or given summons just a few weeks before local elections.

These continuing government escalations are inconsistent with the Hong Kong Basic Law, with international agreements, and with the will of Hongkongers. Brutalizing their own people will not circumvent the core issue here: Beijing's insatiable thirst for control.

I have advocated for Hong Kong since I wrote our Nation's Hong Kong Policy Act back in 1992. I know many of us in this body now want to extend and expand that law in a targeted manner that focuses pressure on the Chinese Communist Party and its agents who are responsible for undermining Hong Kong's autonomy while minimizing the collateral economic damage to the very Hongkongers we want to help.

I am eager to continue working with colleagues, such as Senator RISCH, Senator GRAHAM, Senator RUBIO, and others, toward a strong and procedurally workable solution. Meanwhile, I appreciate statements by administration leaders such as Vice President PENCE and Secretary Pompeo that show a clear-eyed perspective on China's Orwellian tactics and bad intentions.

I urge the administration to use the significant leverage and authorities it already has, particularly under the Global Magnitsky Act, to hold individuals accountable.

Hong Kong is not the only recent reminder that we live in a dangerous world in which America's interests, allies, and ideals are constantly threatened. Press reports this morning indicated that Israel is suffering yet another round of terror, including more than 160 rocket launches fired against civilian targets in Israel. This comes after Israeli forces appear to have eliminated one high-ranking leader in the terrorist group Palestinian Islamic Jihad, in Gaza, and targeted another PIJ terrorist in Damascus, Syria.

The United States stands with our ally Israel against PIJ, Hamas, and Hezbollah terrorists who have long sought to erase the Jewish State. If these reports are accurate, it will be no surprise that one of these terrorist leaders was holed up in Damascus.

Syria, under Assad, stands alongside Iran as the chief patron of anti-Israel terrorism. This is just another reminder that the United States and some of our closest allies have a strong say in the future of Syria and that a victory for Assad will be a victory for Iran and for terrorism.

So every hour seemingly brings more evidence of our troubled world, but, just as with the trade agreements, critical legislation in this area is currently frozen in place. It is another casualty of Democrats' apparent inability to make headway on anything besides fighting with the White House.

For the second time in 2 months, Senate Democrats recently voted once again to filibuster the annual funding for our Armed Forces—for our men and women in uniform—and while Senate

Democrats block appropriations for defense, House Democrats are now slow-walking the authorizing legislation—the NDAA. Since the first NDAA was passed way back in 1961, Congress has never failed to pass a bipartisan NDAA by the end of the year—not once. Yet with House Democrats fixated on impeachment, I understand that Chairman ADAM SMITH and his fellow Democrats are now dragging their heels on the conference committee that is needed to complete this bill. These House Democrats passed a uniquely partisan NDAA earlier this year, unlike the Senate's bipartisan version, and now they are slow-walking the conference committee.

These are among our most basic governing responsibilities: passing an NDAA and funding our Armed Forces. The United States of America cannot operate at less than full strength on the world stage because Democrats are too busy—too busy—impeaching the Commander in Chief.

NOMINATIONS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, on one final matter, while our Democratic colleagues continue to block the Senate from moving forward with defense funding here on the floor, we will use this time to confirm more of the President's well-qualified nominees to the executive branch and to the Federal bench.

Later this week we will consider the nomination of Steven J. Menashi to be U.S. circuit judge for the Second Circuit. Mr. Menashi is a graduate of Dartmouth College and Stanford University Law School. He has accrued an impressive record in private practice and earned clerkships on the D.C. Circuit and the Supreme Court with Justice Alito.

First, we will consider the nomination of Chad Wolf to serve in a senior leadership position post at the Department of Homeland Security. Mr. Wolf's experience at the Department dates back to the immediate aftermath of the September 11th terrorist attacks. He has had a hand in arranging our Nation's critical homeland security infrastructure. The current Acting Secretary of DHS has called him a "proven, thoughtful, and principled executive," and a former Assistant Secretary at the Department said, "Chad knows the issues cold."

I hope my colleagues will join me in advancing each of these nominations later this week.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Chad F. Wolf, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary for Strategy, Policy, and Plans, Department of Homeland Security. (New Position)

Mr. McCONNELL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

IMMIGRATION

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, today, the Supreme Court heard oral arguments in the case against the President's decision to cancel DACA, the program that grants legal status to over 600,000 Dreamers who were brought to this country through no fault of their own, who voluntarily came forward and registered with the government in exchange for protected status, who work in our factories and our hospitals, who teach and learn in our schools and serve in our military. Before the highest Court in the land, President Trump and his administration cruelly argued that these Dreamers do not belong in America and must be ripped away from their families and sent back to countries that many of them do not even remember.

The President once tweeted: "Does anybody really want to throw out good, educated and accomplished young people who have jobs, some serving in the military? Really!" Now the same President is saying some Dreamers are "very tough, hardened criminals," and his administration has argued they should be deported. Donald Trump's hypocrisy when it comes to Dreamers knows no bounds. After flip-flopping again and again on the issue and after failing to lead an effort to pass comprehensive immigration reform, it is abjectly shameful that President Trump is trying to get the Supreme Court to do his dirty work and put the Dreamers under threat of mass deportation.

When the DACA Program was established in 2012, under a long tradition of administrative discretion, it changed the lives of thousands and thousands of Dreamers for the better, and it made our country better. Yet, because of President Trump and his relentless scapegoating of immigrants—his cynical use of trying to tell too many of

the American people that the Dreamers are the reason they are not doing well, which is despicable—these hard-working and patriotic Americans are haunted by the possibility they could be forced to leave this country at any moment—be pulled away from their families, their jobs, their homes. It is cruel. It is counterproductive. It undermines American values and all that America stands for.

Thankfully, one of the first things the House Democrats did when they won the majority was to pass a permanent legislative solution for DACA recipients and TPS holders. It is legislation I wholeheartedly support. Now it is up to the Supreme Court to defend the program. It is up to Majority Leader McConnell to bring the Dream and Promise Act to the Senate floor.

My good friend Senator DURBIN, who has been a champion for Dreamers for as long as I can remember, will ask for the Senate's consent this evening to take up these bills. I thank him for his moral and continued strong leadership on this issue. I could not agree more with what he is trying to do. It is time to do the right thing for Dreamers and enshrine DACA into law.

We will see how my Republican friends respond. After all, the House has done its job. Where are the Senate Republicans who claim to stand with the Dreamers? We will see this evening.

From my home in Brooklyn, I can see the great lady in the harbor who welcomed my ancestors many years ago. If America is to remain the greatest Nation in the world and a beacon of hope and freedom for people everywhere—a light among nations—we must live up to our best values. That means we must stand totally and wholeheartedly with the Dreamers and all 11 million who now live in the shadows.

NOMINATIONS

Madam President, on nominations, we are here at the beginning of another week in the Senate. As is the norm under Leader McConnell, we will not be debating legislation like the Dream Act in order to improve the lives of average Americans. Instead, we will vote on another slate of controversial Trump administration nominees.

First up is the nomination of Chad Wolf to serve as an Under Secretary at the Department of Homeland Security. Mr. Wolf has had leadership roles within the DHS through much of Trump's Presidency and has troubling ties to President Trump's disastrous family separation policy, the Muslim ban, and the national emergency declaration at the southern border. Despite testifying that he was not involved in the family separation policy, Mr. Wolf reportedly suggested the policy in a memo he sent to then-Attorney General Sessions. He is ashamed to admit it. He knows it was wrong, but he did it anyway. This man does not deserve to be an Under Secretary at DHS.

The circumstances of Mr. Wolf's nomination are also very strange. Wolf

is not only already serving as an Under Secretary in an acting capacity, but President Trump has named him as the incoming Secretary of DHS in an acting capacity. President Trump never bothered to nominate a replacement for departing DHS Secretary McAleenan, who left yesterday. Yet the Senate is being asked to confirm someone to a job he is not even going to perform. Indeed, if Mr. Wolf is confirmed, we may never vote on who will be the actual Secretary of DHS, which is a major Cabinet-level department.

This is completely unacceptable. The administration is having trouble finding people to fill these jobs. They know the cruelty they will be asked to enforce, and they know that Donald Trump will treat them poorly. So he can't find anybody to take these positions. Hence, we have this awkward game of musical chairs. Rather than working with Congress to find a DHS Secretary whom we could support, the Trump administration is trying a legal end-around that subverts our constitutional duty to advise and consent.

Regardless of your ideology or views on immigration, my fellow Senators should oppose Wolf's nomination on constitutional grounds.

After the Senate considers Mr. Wolf, we will consider the nomination of Steven Menashi to serve on the Second Circuit Court of Appeals.

I have rarely met a nominee as low as Mr. Menashi. He has a troubling record on race, women's equality, LGBTQ rights, and the rights of immigrants. His conduct before the Committee on the Judiciary was insulting, and recent reports describe how, during his tenure while working at the Department of Education, he played a leading role in designing an illegal effort to deny debt relief to thousands of students who had been swindled by for-profit colleges. That is right. The Senate is going to be asked to confirm someone, Mr. Menashi, to be a judge who designed an illegal scheme to deny debt relief so as to defraud students. The man has no principles. The man has no conscience. The man has no morals. He should not be on the bench.

AGENT ORANGE

Madam President, finally, about our veterans and Agent Orange, yesterday, our Nation observed Veterans Day. It was a chance for all of us to say thank you to the millions of brave Americans who have served our country. It was a day not only to celebrate their achievements and express a deep and abiding gratitude for their service but also to recognize that for many veterans, sacrifices have come as a result of military service and that those sacrifices are not yet over. I want to shed light on one particular issue today.

There are now hundreds of thousands of veterans who suffer from diseases that have been linked to Agent Orange, which is a chemical that was used by our military during the Vietnam war. One's exposure to Agent Orange can lead to a host of complications—diabetes, leukemia, and more. The VA has

long provided benefits to veterans who suffer from these conditions. It has provided healthcare and compensation so as to help to defer the hardships veterans have faced from the wounds from which they still suffer after having been on the battlefield.

In response to more recent studies, in 2017, VA Secretary Shulkin decided to add bladder cancer, hypertension, Parkinson's-like symptoms, and hypothyroidism to the list of Agent Orange-related conditions that are eligible for benefits, which would have improved the lives of 83,000 vets. Shockingly, once again, within this cruel administration—it doesn't even care about our veterans—it was reported that OMB Director and White House Chief of Staff Mulvaney has decided to block benefits for these new conditions because he is worried about the cost. It is disgraceful.

Let me repeat.

Despite the recommendation of President Trump's VA Secretary and the recommendation of the National Academy of Medicine, Mulvaney has decided to block health benefits to sick veterans. Many of these veterans are retired, and many don't have a steady income. These benefits could make the difference between life and death, but Mick Mulvaney—the same Mick Mulvaney who thought \$1.5 trillion was an acceptable cost to give billionaires and corporations in a giant tax cut, which created a huge deficit—now believes that the cost of helping 83,000 sick veterans is just too high.

This is incomprehensibly cruel. When are the American people going to wake up and see what the Trump administration is doing? He gives tax breaks to billionaires but no benefits to veterans who are suffering from the result of Agent Orange exposure?

My home State of New York has 240,000 veterans from the Vietnam era. Many of them were exposed to Agent Orange without realizing it. Just yesterday, the Buffalo News profiled the life of Vietnam veteran Dick Gabel, who was drafted into the Army at age 19. In his approximately 2 years of service, he was shot in the leg. He recovered and was sent back to the war. He lost many of his closest friends along the way. After he came home, for decades, Dick worked with kids in his hometown to make Veterans Day an annual highlight, and he brought together hundreds of veterans to volunteer at local schools. Just last year, he was diagnosed with leukemia, possibly because of his exposure to Agent Orange.

There are likely thousands of veterans in New York who are like Dick—fighting illnesses that are directly linked to Agent Orange and their military service in Vietnam. Yet, because they got the wrong disease, the Trump administration is blocking their health benefits.

So today—a day after millions of Americans, myself included, marched in the parades across our country to

honor our vets—I demand that Chief of Staff Mulvaney reverse this cruel and unfair decision immediately.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

TURKEY AND SYRIA

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam President, I start by thanking the Democratic leader for his leadership in raising those important issues before the Senate this afternoon.

I bring another issue before the Senate, that being my strong opposition to President Trump's shameful decision to invite Turkish President Erdogan to the White House tomorrow. It is a decision that has alarmed our allies and comforted our adversaries. It is a decision that undermines our values and our national security interests, and it is a decision that sends a terrible message to the world about how to get invited to President Trump's White House.

In just the last 5 weeks, Turkish President Erdogan has taken the following actions: No. 1, he has launched an attack on a key ally of ours—in fact, the key ally—in our fight against ISIS terrorists, that being the Syrian Democratic Forces, led by the Syrian Kurds. No. 2, President Erdogan and his forces have killed over 200 in these attacks, displaced over 300,000, and enabled the release of over 100 ISIS prisoners. No. 3, Erdogan is using jihadi proxies that include a lot of al-Qaida elements, and they are committing gross human rights abuses, including what the Trump administration has acknowledged as being war crimes. There are also reports that the Turkish-backed proxy forces are using the chemical agent white phosphorus. No. 4, Erdogan and his forces have violated the so-called safe zone agreement that was reached by Vice President PENCE in Ankara a few weeks ago. After President Erdogan entered into that agreement with Vice President PENCE, which has been violated, he turned around and decided to cut a separate deal with Putin and Russia, thereby giving Russia even more leverage than it already had in Syria.

In addition, Erdogan boasted that he organized a hit squad to assassinate the top commander of our Syrian Kurdish allies, General Mazloum. President Erdogan did that even after President Trump acknowledged that our Syrian Kurdish allies had given us important information that had helped us to kill ISIS leader Baghdadi. In fact, Erdogan has compared the military leader of our Syrian Kurdish allies—those who bore the brunt of the fight against ISIS—with the ISIS leader whom we just killed, Baghdadi. President Erdogan did all of that in just the last 5 weeks.

What did President Trump do?

Instead of calling upon the House and the Senate to pass the economic sanctions bill that had been introduced, he rewarded Erdogan for all of those actions with a coveted White House meeting.

That is not the way we should be treating somebody who has just spent the last 5 weeks thumbing his nose at the United States, undermining our interests, endangering our allies, strengthening Russia, Assad, and Iran, and increasing threats to our ally Israel.

It sends a terrible message to the world: Go ahead and undermine the national security interests of the United States, and the President of the United States will invite you over for dinner.

I have teamed up with Senator GRAHAM and others on a bipartisan basis, and I want to thank the Presiding Officer for her support on that sanctions legislation to hold Turkey accountable.

Here is what Senator GRAHAM said about President Erdogan just 3 weeks ago: "If you want to get Erdogan's attention, you have to treat him like the thug he is." That is Senator GRAHAM speaking. Yet Erdogan, time and again over the last 5 weeks and before, has essentially spit in the eye of the United States, and now he is coming to Washington for a White House meeting. This is very difficult to explain. I am not sure any of us has the answer as to why President Trump is doing this.

The Washington Post had an article on October 17 headlined "In Turkey's President, Trump seems to have found a soul mate." If you read through the article, you can see that President Trump does seem to have an affinity for President Erdogan of Turkey, and clearly President Erdogan likes to get on the phone with President Trump because whenever he does, President Erdogan seems to get his way.

Now he will come for a face-to-face meeting, and I am sure President Erdogan expects to get his way again. Why would he think that? Well, because the last time they talked, President Erdogan clearly took away from the conversation that it was just fine with President Trump if Turkey attacked our Syrian Kurdish allies. President Erdogan clearly believed he had the green light. In fact, after they hung up from that phone call, President Erdogan sent his forces and used proxy forces to attack our Syrian Kurdish allies, and President Trump tweeted that we were withdrawing some of our Special Forces from the area—Special Forces that had helped deter Turkish aggression against our Syrian Kurdish allies.

It is very rare for retired senior military leaders in the United States to criticize a sitting Commander in Chief, but the betrayal of our Syrian Kurdish allies and the terrible message that sent around the world about the unreliability of the United States compelled many of those former leaders to warn about the consequences. I think it is important for the Senate to hear some comments from people who are respected for what they have done for our country.

ADM William McRaven, former commander of the U.S. Special Operations Command, who worked with our Syrian

Kurdish allies in the fight against ISIS, said: “He’s”—referring to President Trump—“obviously left our allies the Kurds on the battlefield. . . . We feel like we’ve betrayed them. He’s undermined our NATO allies . . . the international community has lost faith in America.” That is from Admiral McRaven.

GEN Joseph Votel, former commander of U.S. Central Command and also somebody who has personal experience working alongside our Syrian Kurdish allies in the fight against ISIS, said: “This policy abandonment threatens to undo five years’ worth of fighting against ISIS and will severely damage American credibility and reliability in any future fights where we need strong allies.”

General Petraeus, former commander of U.S. Central Command and former commander of NATO’s mission in Afghanistan and in Iraq, said: “Well, I think we have abandoned our Syrian Kurdish partners. They took over 10,000 losses as the defeat of the Islamic State was carried out.”

Secretary James Mattis, Secretary of Defense under President Trump and former commander of U.S. Central Command, said: “In this case, if we don’t keep the pressure on, then ISIS will resurge.”

Secretary Mattis made it clear that by abandoning our Syrian Kurdish allies, we gave more oxygen to ISIS. In fact, we learned over the weekend that ISIS was claiming responsibility for the murder of an Armenian Catholic priest and his son. Their funeral services are today.

Another former high-level U.S. military commander who has spoken is ADM James Stavridis. He is the former commander of U.S. European Command and NATO Supreme Allied Commander in Europe. Here is what he had to say: “This is heart-rending for anybody who has shed blood, who has deployed forward. . . . I’m getting so many inputs from all around the military . . . they know how this hurts at a very personal level. . . . It’s not only the betrayal of the Kurds, it is the way it is going to allow those embers on the floor of the forest fire that we thought were out to kind of re-flash.” He is saying, in other words, giving more oxygen to the ISIS embers that we were working toward extinguishing.

Gen. John Allen, former commander of NATO International Security Assistance Force and U.S. Forces—Afghanistan, was even blunter: “There is blood on Trump’s hands for abandoning our Kurdish allies.”

Those are from former top U.S. military leaders, patriots who fought with our Syrian Kurdish allies in the fight against ISIS.

There is also a statement from Brett McGurk. So who is Brett McGurk? Brett McGurk was the Presidential Envoy for the Global Coalition to Counter ISIS. He had that position under the previous President and for President Trump for a time. Here is

what Brett McGurk had to say: “I’ve worked for three presidents and participated in a number of foreign leader calls. I cannot recall a President that seems to believe—and then parrots—whatever a foreign leader tells him on the phone. Such information is often false, intended to influence more than inform.” Yet what we saw was that when President Trump hung up on that phone call with President Erdogan, he essentially green-lighted that operation. That is why President Erdogan likes to get President Trump on the phone directly or talk to him directly, which he is going to get a chance to do tomorrow.

Probably the most damning of all the comments I have heard—and this was not unique, but it was unique in the way it was characterized—came from the mother of a cadet at the Naval Academy. What was interesting is that she has been a loyal supporter of President Trump. She supported him, she voted for him, and she stuck with him, but after the betrayal of our Syrian Kurdish allies, she said that she no longer could trust him and that she worried that her son at the Naval Academy would essentially be left to the whims of a Commander in Chief whom she could no longer trust. That was all before President Trump invited President Erdogan to the White House.

What we should be doing is passing tough economic sanctions. What we should be doing is holding Turkey and President Erdogan accountable for undermining our security and helping to give new oxygen to ISIS. That is why the House of Representatives passed a bipartisan sanctions bill by a whopping veto-proof vote of 403 to 16. That is why Senator GRAHAM and I have introduced bipartisan sanctions legislation in the U.S. Senate, which has more than 14 bipartisan cosponsors and growing. I do want to thank the Presiding Officer for her efforts to hold President Erdogan accountable with this legislation. There is also other legislation introduced by Senator MENENDEZ and Senator RISCH.

Here is what I know: The most important thing is that this body, the Senate, should act right now. We have the House bill sitting at the desk. We have the bill introduced by Senator GRAHAM and me sitting at the desk. Right now we should just pass those sanctions bills and send a message to President Erdogan that while he may be going to the White House tomorrow, he does not have support in the Congress.

I have talked about Erdogan’s actions for the last 5 weeks. I would like to take us back 5 years from the period we are in right now. In the fall of that year, mid-September 2014, ISIS terrorist forces were encircling the Syrian Kurdish town of Kobani. Kobani is a town on the Syrian side of the Turkey-Syria border. ISIS was laying siege to that town. They had already taken a lot of the surrounding villages, and they were closing in on this last Syrian Kurdish stronghold.

The Syrian Kurds were totally outnumbered by ISIS, and the Syrian Kurds asked the United States for help. It took us a little longer than it should have—took us weeks, not days—but we agreed to help supply our Syrian Kurdish allies with weapons and equipment in the fight against ISIS.

We asked Turkey if they would help us supply weapons to the Syrian Kurds because Kobani is right there on the Syria-Turkey border. Turkey refused. President Erdogan said no. So the United States, at greater risk to our own forces, had to airdrop weapons and supplies into Iraq from U.S. aircraft, and with that help, our Syrian Kurdish forces were able to stop ISIS from taking over Kobani and began to push them out and, again with our help, primarily from the air, pushed them out. In that fight over the last 5 years, the Syrian Kurds have lost over 11,000 men and women, soldiers and others. That is what they have lost in the fight with us against ISIS.

Turkey, on the other hand, not only did not lift a finger in that fight, but for the past 5 years and even more the years before, they turned a blind eye to ISIS fighters transiting through Turkey, so ISIS was growing stronger as a result of their negligence.

I want to close by responding to those who say: Well, you know what, Turkey is a NATO ally, and so we should invite President Erdogan over to the White House.

I see on the floor my friend and colleague, Senator DURBIN from Illinois, and he, along with myself and others, has made this point repeatedly. We would like Turkey to be a strong NATO ally. Over the years of NATO alliance, they have in the past been a good partner, but under President Erdogan’s leadership, they have taken Turkey in a very different direction.

The issue is not whether the United States wants Turkey to be a member of NATO; the question is, Does Turkey really want to stay in the alliance? Because everything they have done shows they are violating the values and principles of our alliance.

President Erdogan decided to purchase the Russian-made S-400 anti-aircraft system against our strong objection. This is a system that would have put our F-35 pilots at risk and undermined NATO security. President Erdogan said he didn’t care. He went ahead with the S-400 purchase, and those S-400s are sitting in Turkey right now.

He was willing to work with Russia, Iran, Assad to undermine our interests in the area. We have talked today about how he attacked our Syrian Kurdish allies. He has repeatedly threatened the European Parliament, European Union, with releasing refugees if they do not cooperate with him and don’t turn a blind eye to the fact that he has locked up more journalists than any other country on earth, including Iran, Egypt, North Korea, and Saudi Arabia.

So, Madam President, the fact that the President of the United States has invited Erdogan to the White House, after everything Erdogan has done to undermine our values and security, is a shame on the United States. It will undermine our national security interests. It has already alarmed our allies and heartened our adversaries.

It is important that all of us—all of us in this House and Senate—on a bipartisan basis, speak out—as we have been doing—against the shameful chapter in our American foreign policy and national security.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized.

COUNTERFEITERS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Today I am here to discuss the critical need to protect American businesses and consumers from the dangers of counterfeits, particularly counterfeit goods sold online.

Counterfeits do incredible damage to our country's economic competitiveness. They harm intellectual property right holders and the reputation of online marketplaces, undermine the integrity of our supply chains, and even threaten the health and safety of consumers. So it is Congress's responsibility to use its oversight and legislative authority to identify ways to prevent these illicit goods from entering our borders.

Over the past year, I have worked with the Finance Committee Ranking Member WYDEN to investigate how counterfeiters use e-commerce to sell their phony goods to consumers. Last week, we concluded our investigation and issued a report detailing our findings.

Based on the information presented to Senator WYDEN and this Senator by right holders, trade associations, e-commerce platforms, and common carriers, we made five findings in this report, and we identified two legislative recommendations for Congress in this report. I believe these recommendations will enhance existing efforts within the Federal Government to prevent the sale of counterfeits online.

I will talk briefly about our findings today, and I look forward to working with my colleagues—both Republican and Democrat—to identify additional areas for congressional action.

As chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, I recognize the value of intellectual property rights and their impacts on society and the economy. Intellectual property rights allow businesses to generate new ideas and develop creative solutions to everyday problems that can make our lives healthier, safer, and more productive. I also understand businesses and innovators rely on those rights to help drive and recoup their investments.

In my own State of Iowa, intellectual property represents more than \$14.4 billion in annual exports for the State, more than 94,000 jobs, and supports more than 2,000 small businesses with

less than 500 employees. However, counterfeits are increasingly threatening these achievements and the hard work of the people that innovate. It has been estimated that international trade for counterfeit goods in 2016 accounted for \$509 billion of world trade.

Counterfeits are found in both physical and online marketplaces, and almost every industry is affected. Scam artists target electronics, automotive parts, and even children's toys, to rip-off consumers and to make a profit. Counterfeits can also harm consumers. Many consumers do not know that counterfeits can be dangerous and that some have been found to contain lead, excessive small parts, and even unsafe chemicals.

In 2018, the Government Accountability Office—or GAO, as we know it around Washington—examined how e-commerce marketplaces are further enabling the sale of counterfeits. GAO found that counterfeiters use online marketplaces to sell fakes to consumers because they can hide their identity by using false or incomplete names. Counterfeiters also post legitimate photos or fake reviews for their products, which makes it harder for consumers to determine whether they are buying a legitimate or fake good.

The Grassley-Wyden investigation showed that the breadth and variety of goods sold online makes it nearly impossible to prevent the sale of all counterfeits. Right holders also told us that their enforcement efforts are hindered in part because the U.S. Customs and Border Protection shares very limited—and often heavily redacted—importation information with these right holders. But right holders need importation information to identify counterfeit sellers and report suspected counterfeit listings.

Counterfeits also pose a threat to e-commerce and to common carriers. Counterfeits smear the reputation of e-commerce and threaten the integrity of the common carrier supply chain network. As such, these parties are critical partners in the fight against the sale of counterfeit goods. However, Customs and Border Protection does not have the authority to share importation information with these parties when it identifies a counterfeit at our border.

During our investigation, these parties told us that this information would give them the ability to better protect our country's intellectual property and allow them to remove more counterfeit listings and block counterfeit sellers. We must look at this problem holistically and with the understanding that right holders, e-commerce platforms, and common carriers are critical partners in the fight against the sale of counterfeit goods and those counterfeit goods being sold online. By sharing more importation information, these parties can better protect the intellectual property rights of our innovators, as well as the health and safety of e-commerce consumers.

Our investigation is but a first step. I will continue to use my oversight authority to look for innovative solutions to protect intellectual property right holders and consumers from the negative effects of counterfeits.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASSIDY). The Senator from Illinois.

IMMIGRATION

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I was honored today to attend the second hearing I have attended in the Supreme Court of the United States. If you stand right here on the floor of the Senate and look east through these glass doors, you can almost see the Supreme Court buildings directly across the street. The Supreme Court is, many times, the last stop when it comes to human rights and civil rights. After all the work that has been done by the Congress, by the President, many times, it is the Supreme Court that has the last word.

In the case of *Plessy v. Ferguson*, when the Supreme Court held that segregation was constitutional, that last word was a disappointment. And *Korematsu v. The United States*, when the Supreme Court upheld the internment of Japanese Americans during World War II, that was another disappointment.

But other times, the Supreme Court has risen to the challenge: The famous case of *Brown vs. Board of Education*, which finally struck down the concept of separate but equal; *Obergefell vs. Hodges*, where the Supreme Court recognized the right to marriage equality.

Well, today, the Supreme Court faces another human rights issue involving another group. Just a few hours ago, the street between the Capitol and the Supreme Court was literally filled with thousands and thousands of demonstrators. The issue before the Court today was the fate of DACA, the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals.

This measure, DACA, is one that I have worked on for many years—many years. Nineteen years ago, I introduced the DREAM Act. Before that, the term “Dreamer” was hardly ever applied in the conversation about immigration, but now, it has become standard and really defines this group of Americans, people living in America.

In their case, they came to the United States, brought here by their parents, when they were children. They may have had legal entry into the United States, but at some point in their lives, they no longer were legal. They became undocumented, in the words of the law. Most of these young people never knew that status until they reached their teenage years and their parents finally told them the truth of their legal condition.

They had no control over the decision of their parents to come to this country or file the necessary papers. Frankly, many of them were shocked to learn that they were undocumented. They went to school with our kids. They grew up in our communities.

They played on the sports teams. They probably attended the same churches and temples and synagogues as our own kids. They were just part of the group. But they knew—they privately knew they were not. They knew that they were one knock on the door away from being deported from the United States.

It was because of one of these young people that I decided to introduce that DREAM Act legislation 19 years ago. Her name is Tereza Lee, brought to the United States at the age of 2 from Korea by her parents to Chicago. She grew up in a family that struggled to make ends meet. Her father wanted to be a minister, but never quite put that church together. Her mother worked in a dry-cleaning establishment to feed the family. She went to public schools, and as luck would have it, there was a program at one of these schools called the Merit Music program that gave her a chance to learn how to play the piano.

She started playing, and she followed her father around to these churches. Then she took it seriously, and she became an amazing pianist to the point where, when she finished the public high school, she was offered an opportunity to go on for music education at the Manhattan Conservatory of Music. When she filled out her application and reached the point where they asked her nationality and citizenship, she asked her mom: What am I supposed to put on here? Her mom said: I am not sure. We better call Senator DURBIN's office.

They did, and we checked the law, and the law is very harsh. For Tereza Lee—who had lived 15 or 16 years in the United States, beat the odds by finishing high school and developing this great talent at the piano—the law told her that she had to leave the United States for 10 years and apply to return. That is the law.

It seemed unfair to me that a young woman, brought here at the age of 2, should face that as her only legal choice, so I introduced the DREAM Act. It said, if you were brought here as a child, raised in the United States, went to school, and had no criminal record of significance, that you should be given a chance—the chance to make it in the United States to earn your way to legal status and citizenship.

That is what the DREAM Act was all about. We passed it in the House and in the Senate, but never in the same Congress, so it is still not the law of the land. It was 8 years ago when I appealed to my former colleague in the Senate, Barack Obama, as President, to try to help, and he did.

By Executive action, he created DACA, which said that young people like Tereza Lee could apply, go through a criminal background check, fill out the necessary forms, pay the filing fee, and be allowed to stay in the United States for 2 years at a time, renewable, not to be deported, and be able to legally work.

After President Obama came up with DACA, over 780,000 young people came

forward and became protected by DACA. It really changed their lives. For the first time in their lives, they had some government-recognized status. They were no longer just undocumented. Then amazing things happened. They went on and pursued an education, a career, a life, a future. They started realizing their dreams. It was a good and positive thing all around.

Then, President Trump came into office. Initially, he was very complimentary of Dreamers, saying positive things about them, but, unfortunately, over a period of time he changed his attitude about this issue. On September 5, 2017, President Trump announced he was going to end the DACA Program, end the protection for these young people.

It was a sad day and a challenge for us to decide what to do, to try to pass legislation in the Congress that would protect these young people, and we rolled up our sleeves and put together several bipartisan measures in the Senate. President Trump rejected every single one of them. He wasn't going to give it. He was opposed to our enacting legislation that dealt with it.

That repeal of DACA has created uncertainty for hundreds of thousands. A lawsuit was filed in an effort to try to protect them, and the courts said their protection would continue while the case was being argued. The case worked its way through the courts and ended up, this morning, at the U.S. Supreme Court across the street.

I was proud to lead 172 current and former Members of Congress on a bipartisan amicus brief in support of DACA. Now it is clearly up to the Justices in the Supreme Court to follow the law and to reject what I consider to be President Trump's illegal repeal of DACA, but only Congress can provide a permanent solution for Dreamers.

The U.S. House of Representatives has responded to President Trump's cruel decision to repeal DACA by passing the Dream and Promise Act on a strong bipartisan vote of 237 to 187. This legislation is based on the DREAM Act I originally introduced 19 years ago. This bipartisan legislation would give Dreamers a chance to earn their citizenship. The bill passed the House. It is here. It is now up to Senator MITCH MCCONNELL of Kentucky, the Republican leader, to call the Dream and Promise Act for a vote in the U.S. Senate.

Mr. President, I want to make a unanimous consent request in relation to that measure and ask for a consent after we debate my UC request to complete my remarks. I see a Senator on the floor who I believe is here to object. I want to be courteous to her because she has been in the Chair for a while. Can I have a unanimous consent to return to the debate after I make my unanimous consent request?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H.R. 6

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, for clarity, I ask unanimous consent to bring to the floor the Dream and Promise Act for a vote in the Senate—a measure which would address the very issue that is before the Supreme Court today. I am making this on behalf of Senator SCHUMER, Senator LEAHY, Senator ROSEN, Senator TIM Kaine, Senator MENENDEZ, and Senator CARDIN.

As if in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 112, H.R. 6; further, that the bill be considered read a third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. President, I am reserving the right to object, and I will object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. President, I would like to articulate the reason for the objection to the legislation that is brought forward by my friend the Senator from Illinois.

Once again, I found it necessary for the good of the order to object to a unanimous consent request brought by our friends in the minority. Once again, they are attempting to bypass the Senate's rules on behalf of a piece of legislation this body has not had time to debate, to deliberate, or to consider in committee.

The American Dream and Promise Act passed the House of Representatives by a near party-line vote; unsurprisingly, considering the bill addresses the contentious issue of immigration law. This bill, supported by the Senator from Illinois, would offer temporary legal status to 2½ million undocumented immigrants.

Those affected immigrants have tried to remain in the United States under the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals, or the DACA Program—a backstop made possible by nothing more than an Executive memo signed by former President Barack Obama.

I think this is important for us to realize that it was an Executive memo that put this program in place. It is not a Federal law. President Trump ended the DACA Program in 2017, arguing the Obama administration's attempt to subvert immigration law on such a massive scale was unlawful and possibly unconstitutional. Soon after, President Trump offered a path to legalization for DACA recipients, but our friends in the minority refused to take him up on that offer.

We have to remember this: There was a path to legalization for DACA recipients that was offered by President Donald Trump. Our friends in the minority said: No; no, we do not want that.

They continued with the issue. I will tell you, every Dreamer in the country should be outraged by the minority's

refusal to come to the table and negotiate on an offer that was on the table. I encourage my friends on the other side of the aisle to remember that the Supreme Court affirmed a lower court decision to maintain an injunction on the nationwide DAPA Program—a scheme similar to DACA but aimed at parents, as opposed to children.

Although that decision set no legal precedent, it did open up an opportunity for the new administration—and for each and every one of us in the Senate—to rebuild various fixes in our immigration system without running afoul of existing legal barriers.

As my friend the Senator from Illinois likes to point out, Senators from both sides of the aisle have been working on this issue—it has been with us for years—and it is imperative we find a consensus solution.

If the minority wishes to offer peace of mind and a path forward to Dreamers, they should do it in such a way that allows the American people to hold each and every one of us accountable for repercussions. We should do this through regular order. I reiterate my objection to the minority whip's motion.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator object?

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. President, yes, I do object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, for the record, how many pieces of legislation did we consider in the Senate last week? None. The week before? None. How many months has this measure been sitting in the Senate, the Republican-controlled Senate? Five months, and for five months the Republican leader has not considered it worthy to even bring it before the Senate for debate.

I don't control the agenda. Senator MCCONNELL does. He has decided this measure is not worth debating on the floor of the U.S. Senate.

When I come and make a unanimous consent request to bring this measure to the floor, it isn't as if we are taking away an option, which the Republican leader is using. He is not. When we look back to the debate or at least the effort to find a compromise with President Trump on this issue, it is next to impossible. He is surrounded by people who are completely against DACA and Dreamers. Stephen Miller is a good illustration of one. It used to be Jeff Sessions. He is no longer with the administration. Every time the President starts to lean toward DACA and the Dreamers, these people intervene and stop him, and negotiations come to an end.

It is time for us in the Senate not to wait for a permission slip from President Trump to pass legislation. I am prepared to bring this matter to the floor and to accept the decision on the amendments on the floor. We are in the minority. We will lose some of these

amendments. So be it. Let's let the Senate be the Senate and deliberate these measures. To argue that I shouldn't be asking to bring it to the floor because it has to go through regular order, the obvious question is: When is Senator MCCONNELL going to pursue regular order on a measure that has been sitting here for 5 months?

Let me say a word, if I can, while we are on the subject, about the people who are involved. We can talk about Senate procedure and law all we wish, but what we should do is discuss the real people who are involved.

In 1,000 days in office, this President has issued 11,000 tweets. No surprise, is it? There are 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 a day. He issued one this morning about the young people who are in question here. I would like to read President Donald Trump's tweet from this morning, as the case was headed to the Supreme Court. Here is what he tweeted:

Many of the people in DACA, no longer very young, are far from "angels." Some are very tough, hardened criminals. President Obama said he had no legal right to sign order, but would anyway. If Supreme Court remedies with overturn, a deal will be made with Dems for them to stay!

May I address one particular aspect of the tweet of the President of the United States on this subject affecting the fate of 780,000 young people living in the United States? Probably the best thing is not to do it generically but to talk about specifics.

Let me tell you a story about two DACA recipients, both attending Loyola University in Chicago—the city I am honored to represent. They both came to Washington, DC, today, and sat in the Supreme Court during the argument. I am going to leave it up to my Members and colleagues in the Senate, as well as those who are following this debate, to reach their own conclusion about these two whom I am about to tell the story of. You decide whether this man is a tough and hardened criminal. His name is Cesar Montelongo. He grew up in the State of New Mexico. He was a pretty good student. In fact, he was an excellent student. He graduated from high school with a grade point average of 4.0 and ranked third in his class. He went on to New Mexico State University, where he was a triple major in biology, microbiology, and Spanish, as well as two minors in chemistry and biochemistry. Cesar graduated with a 3.9 GPA.

This hardened criminal then went on to earn a master's degree in biology, with a minor in molecular biology, while working as a teaching assistant. Then DACA came along. For the first time in his life, he had a chance to apply for medical school. He never thought that could happen. He applied and was accepted at Loyola University's Chicago Stritch School of Medicine. It is quite an achievement.

The Presiding Officer, who is also a medical doctor, I am sure understands that, but he did one better. He enrolled in the M.D.-Ph.D. program at Loyola

University. He was just in my office upstairs, and he told me that in a matter of 2 or 3 years, he will have completed his Ph.D. in microbiology, and then he can go on to complete his medical degree and his residency.

This tough, hardened criminal—according to the President—has designs on becoming a medical researcher in the United States of America. When he completes this highly competitive program, he will have a medical degree and a doctorate degree in science.

He is one of dozens of DACA recipients at the Stritch School. My hat is off to Loyola University. They have admitted more DACA students to their medical school than any other medical school in the United States. They are amazing students. I have met them. Many, if not all of them, have promised to come back to my State of Illinois, having had this chance to go to medical school in Chicago, and serve in underserved areas after they have become practicing doctors. Loyola doesn't give them any special treatment in the selection process. They are not eligible for any Federal financial assistance.

I just want to thank them and say to the President of the United States: Before you put out a tweet calling Cesar Montelongo or people like him hardened criminals, Mr. President, take a minute and meet these young people.

While you are at it, meet this young lady too. She was just in my office. Her name is Fernanda Herrera Vera. When she was 2 years old, her family brought her from Mexico to the United States. When she was 7, her family was forced to leave Guntersville, AL, when her father lost his job due to his immigration status. The family settled in Gadsden, AL, where Fernanda attended a private Catholic school on a scholarship.

When she was 10, her parents opened a restaurant. Every day after school, she went to the restaurant to wait tables and help run the restaurant, doing her homework in her spare time. During Fernanda's junior year of high school, Alabama passed the harshest anti-immigration law in the country, which forced her family to close down their restaurant.

Alabama barred Dreamers from attending even public colleges, but thanks to DACA, Fernanda was able to attend a private school, Samford University in Birmingham, AL. Her parents worked hard to pay tuition. She qualified for no Federal financial assistance. Her dad worked 80 hours a week at a chicken plant so that she could go to college. She graduated from Samford in 2017, and her experience has driven her to become an immigration activist. She worked at the Alabama Coalition for Immigrant Justice.

After President Trump repealed DACA in 2017, Fernanda came to Washington for a 4-day hunger fast with other DACA recipients on the Capitol lawn.

Last year, Fernanda was admitted to the Loyola University Chicago School

of Law. But this spring, her mother was pulled over in Georgia for driving with a broken taillight. Her mother is now in deportation proceedings.

It is tough enough to go to school without Federal financial help. It is tough enough to work your way through it. It is tough enough not to know how the Supreme Court is going to rule tomorrow or the day after and whether it will change your fate. It is tough enough to know that any knock at the door could mean deportation for members of your family. Yet she has persevered.

A hardened criminal, Mr. President?

Fernanda's dream is to become an immigration lawyer. She wants to help people just like her mom.

Without DACA, Cesar Montelongo will not become a doctor. Fernanda Herrera Vera will not become an attorney. Will America be a better country if they are forced to leave, if they are deported? I don't think so.

Cesar, Fernanda, and hundreds of thousands of other Dreamers are counting on the Supreme Court to do the right thing and reject President Trump's repeal of DACA. They are also counting on those of us who serve in the Senate to stop making excuses and solve this crisis.

A bill has passed the House. I tried to bring it to the floor of the Senate, and there was an objection today. It isn't because we are overwhelmed with work. As you can see, we spend a lot of time making speeches.

Since Senator MCCONNELL refuses to take any action to address the plight of the Dreamers, I am going to continue to make this unanimous consent request. Next week, I don't want the excuse to be that we are not following regular order, but in the meantime, I hope the Senate Judiciary Committee will take up this measure, as they have so many times over the last 15 years or so, and bring it to the floor of the Senate.

Once and for all, could we be the U.S. Senate for a week? Could we actually consider a piece of legislation here that addresses an issue that is critically important to hundreds of thousands of people living in the United States of America?

What a relief it would be to see this Senate actually as a Senate, to see Members on the floor debating issues. I am not going to win every debate. Every amendment I want is not going to pass, but I am prepared to accept the outcome. Let's do what the Senate was elected to do.

I am sorry there was an objection today. As long as I am a U.S. Senator, I am going to continue to come to the floor of the Senate to advocate for Cesar, Fernanda and all of the Dreamers. It would be an American tragedy to deport these two promising young people.

Now it is in the hands of Senator MITCH MCCONNELL, the Republican majority leader, to give the Dream and Promise Act a vote and to say to those

780,000 who do not know what their future will be just days or weeks from now that there is an answer: We want you to be part of America.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I know my friend from Illinois, Senator DURBIN, is sincere in his desire to get some relief for the DACA recipients, whose case is now pending before the U.S. Supreme Court. I share a desire to give them some certainty. That is why I supported what President Trump offered in February of 2018, which was a pathway to citizenship not only for the individuals who had applied for and received deferred action under President Obama's administration but for all those who were eligible but did not apply.

What continues to confuse me is how our Democratic colleagues will routinely vote against that offer, which was incredibly generous. I don't think any other President in my lifetime would have had the boldness and the courage to offer a pathway to citizenship for 1.8 million DACA-eligible young people, but President Trump did, and our Democratic colleagues turned it down. That leads me to wonder about their sincerity. Do they like this political issue more than they have a desire to find a solution to the problem?

I agree that these young people, who through no fault of their own came to the United States because their parents brought them here, are the most sympathetic and deserving cohort of immigrants in the country. I wish we could work together to come up with a solution. But at some point you have to wonder whether our Democratic colleagues prefer not to solve the problem but would rather try to portray this as a political football for partisan advantage in the runup to the next election.

That is tragic—toying with the lives of these young people, stoking their insecurity, telling them you are on their side but on the other hand voting against an offer to provide them a pathway toward citizenship. I don't know how you reconcile those two positions.

PRESCRIPTION DRUG COSTS

Mr. President, on another matter, I introduced a bill with our colleague from Connecticut, Senator BLUMENTHAL, to address the rising costs at the pharmacy counter. Senator BLUMENTHAL is a Democrat. I am a Republican. He is from Connecticut. I am from Texas. But we both heard the same thing from our constituents: Prescription drugs—particularly the out-of-pocket costs to consumers—are too high, especially with the huge deductibles and the huge copays under the Affordable Care Act.

Over the last several months, we have dug into the reasons behind those high costs, and it is safe to say there is a lot that concerns us.

One of the most egregious forms of abuse we have seen deals with the pat-

ent system. Under the patent system, if you come up with a new lifesaving drug, then you are guaranteed the exclusive right to make and to sell that drug, and you are protected from any competition for a period of time. But after that period of time expires, what is supposed to happen is that generic alternatives are supposed to be available to compete and bring down the price for consumers. That is the case for 90 percent of the drugs we take.

Our country offers the most robust protection in the world for intellectual property. We know companies are unlikely to pour extensive time, money, and resources into developing these new cures unless, at the end of it, there is some reward. I get that, and I support that.

But the patent system is designed to provide a limited time period during which the manufacturer can be the sole seller on the market before generic alternatives can become available and before competitors can enter the market. What is happening is that some companies are abusing that system and extending that period of exclusivity by filing tens—sometimes in excess of 100 patents.

In one case involving a drug called HUMIRA, which is one of the best selling drugs in the world, there are four approved competitors in Europe. In the United States, HUMIRA has in excess of 120 separate patents designed to crowd out and prevent any competition while maintaining their exclusivity in the marketplace.

That is what is called the patent thicketing. It involves using intricate webs of patents to keep competition at bay for as long as possible, meaning that your profits and your exclusive rights to sell this drug are high.

There is also something called product hopping, which occurs when a company develops a reformulation of an existing drug about to lose its exclusivity and then pulls the original product off the market. This is done not because the new formula is more effective necessarily but because pulling the original drug off the market before it loses its exclusivity prevents generic competitors. That is called product hopping.

The bill Senator BLUMENTHAL and I introduced aims to stop these anti-competitive behaviors, allow competitors to come to market sooner, and bring down prices for consumers. The Affordable Prescriptions for Patients Act streamlines the litigation process by limiting the number of patents companies can use when they are litigating their patent rights. Ultimately, we believe—and I believe it is borne out by the Congressional Budget Office scoring—this would allow competitors to resolve patent issues faster and bring those generic drugs to market sooner. This is how we improve competition and lower prices without getting in the way of lifesaving innovation.

The added benefit to this bill is the Federal savings it would provide for

taxpayers. The Congressional Budget Office says that this bill would lower Federal spending by more than half a billion dollars over 10 years. That is not a panacea, but it is a good start. This is just savings to the Federal Government for Medicare and Medicaid. There would undoubtedly be more savings for consumers who get their health coverage through private health insurance.

It checks every box. It checks innovation, increases competition, lowers prices for patients, and saves money for taxpayers. On top of that, this bill has a raft of bipartisan cosponsors. This is not a partisan bill; this is a bipartisan bill. In addition to Senator BLUMENTHAL, five other Democrats have endorsed the bill, including both the Democratic whip and the assistant Democratic leader.

I am sure it comes as no surprise that this bill sailed through the Judiciary Committee without a single Senator voting against it. It was unanimous. During simpler times, it would have quickly passed the full Senate and moved on to the House for their consideration and then gone on to the President for his signature. But we all know things aren't quite that easy these days, and even bipartisan bills get caught up in the political crosshairs.

According to a report in *POLITICO*, the minority leader from New York, Senator SCHUMER, is blocking this bill from passing in the Senate. He is blocking one of his own Member's bills—and one to lower prescription drug prices, of all things. While the American people suffer from the crush of high costs at the pharmacy, he stonewalls, and it is to the detriment of just about everybody—except one group.

I know there are some drug manufacturers that must be thrilled with his blocking the bill that would reduce their compensation and increase competition. You see, the army of special interests who have been fighting my bill since day one when it was introduced is ecstatic that the Democratic leader is blocking this bill, but I am not, and I don't think the rest of the Senate is either because this is a noncontroversial, bipartisan bill. The only thing that Democrats are doing by continuing to hold up this bill is to carry water for one of Washington's most prominent special interest groups. As long as they do, it will be to the detriment of the American people.

I know this frustration is bipartisan because my friend Senator BLUMENTHAL is just as frustrated by this ridiculous holdup as I am. We have tried to reason with the minority leader. We have tried to negotiate. We have tried to get him to allow the bill to come to the floor, but we have had no luck so far.

Last week, I came to the Senate floor to ask unanimous consent to pass this bill, and what happened next felt like a scene from a bad made-for-TV political drama. The minority leader, who was

unwilling to come to the floor and block the bill himself, tried to have one of the cosponsors of my bill do it for him, the Senator from Illinois. He would rather force his own member to block a popular bipartisan bill, which happens to have my name on it, than allow it to pass on its own.

Well, as you can imagine, that didn't go very well. So then it was on to plan B. They wanted to link the fate of our bill, which passed unanimously in the Judiciary Committee, with another bill that hasn't even passed out of committee.

The other bill was introduced by our friends, Senators Grassley and Durbin, and aims to provide greater transparency on drug prices, something that is definitely needed, and I don't object to it. But these bills are in very different places in the legislative process, and some Members on our side have concerns about a bill coming to the floor that hasn't even been through the committee of jurisdiction.

Now, to the minority leader this is just another creative way to stop passage of a noncontroversial bill and attach a free rider onto the bill, which, in essence, is a poison pill. The result is the same. Nothing passes.

As I said, the bill Senator BLUMENTHAL and I have introduced is bipartisan. It is not controversial. It went through regular order. Every member of the Judiciary Committee had a chance to vote on it, and no one voted against it. We checked on our side, and there is no objection. We have run a hotline on the Democratic side, only to find that the Democratic leader is the one himself who is blocking it.

Well, unfortunately, politics, once again, has overwhelmed our collective good judgment and good sense. I know the Democratic leader doesn't want any bills to pass that Republicans can use to tell their constituents that they are listening to their concerns and acting on those concerns in the run up to the next election. He doesn't really care about the merits of the legislation or that it would, in fact, help New Yorkers. It is politically inconvenient, and that, clearly, is his top priority.

The American people deserve better. With the House working day and night to remove the President from office and the next election less than a year away, the opportunities for us to pass any sort of bipartisan legislation are getting slimmer and slimmer.

I plan to return to the floor later this week with my colleague from Connecticut to ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed. If the Democratic leader is going to block the bill, I want it to be clear to the American people and the people who would benefit from the passage of the bill being signed into law. I want them to see him do it and to hold him accountable for his misguided politics.

I hope the minority leader will rethink his decision to block this bill so that we can all work together to deliver bipartisan results for our constituents.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. ROSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Nevada.

NOMINATION OF CHAD F. WOLF

Ms. ROSEN. Mr. President, I rise today in opposition to this administration's nomination of Chad Wolf to be Under Secretary for Strategy, Policy, and Plans at the Department of Homeland Security. I stand here today opposed not only to Mr. Wolf's nomination but also to the way in which this administration is circumventing the constitutional requirement of advice and consent to make Mr. Wolf the head of the third largest Department in the Federal Government.

By the President's own admission, Mr. Wolf is slated to immediately be appointed to serve indefinitely in the position of Acting Secretary of Homeland Security. Thus, our votes tonight and tomorrow are effectively to confirm Chad Wolf to be Acting Secretary of the entire Department of Homeland Security, despite limited vetting, no committee vote, and no confirmation hearing for this position.

But this is about more than just an egregious attempt to bypass the Senate's role of advice and consent for Cabinet nominees. Rather, this evening's vote will advance a nominee who played an integral role in this administration's cruel family separation policy, and tonight's vote is about the refusal of this administration to address its treatment of detained children.

That is why I was so disappointed to see cloture filed on Chad Wolf's nomination. I placed a hold on Mr. Wolf's nomination to be Under Secretary as a result of the ongoing humanitarian crisis at the southern border, which began and grew during Mr. Wolf's tenure as chief of staff to DHS Secretary Nielsen.

Between July 2017 and June 2018, while Mr. Wolf held the position of chief of staff, 2,800 migrant children were separated from their parents and held in DHS custody under this administration's cruel, so-called "zero tolerance" immigration policy.

Even today, we don't know the extent of the damage. Just last week, reports identified 1,500 more children who were separated from their parents during that time. We do, however, know from emails that Chad Wolf played a leading role in developing, suggesting, and implementing this inhumane policy.

When I asked him if he had helped to develop the administration's family separation policy, he said: "No, ma'am." When I asked him if he had concerns with the policy of indefinitely separating children from their parents, Mr. Wolf said: "My job wasn't to determine if it was the right or wrong policy."

When I asked him how he became aware of the policy, he stated that he learned about it in April of 2018. Emails now show that Mr. Wolf had been participating in meetings discussing family separation as far back as December of 2017. The emails showed that Mr. Wolf provided then-Secretary Nielsen a list of 16 options to limit immigration, one of which was to separate families.

Even before these emails came to light, I found Mr. Wolf's failure to take responsibility for his direct involvement in the administration's cruel family separation policy to be both misleading and disingenuous, which is why I voted against his nomination in committee.

I also placed a hold on both Mr. Wolf's nomination and that of DHS CFO nominee Troy Edgar until the inhumane and substandard conditions for children at CBP processing and detention facilities improved significantly. Reports from journalists, attorneys, and advocates detailed ongoing horrific conditions, making it clear that DHS was not taking the actions needed to care for and treat migrant children at the southern border.

I witnessed these conditions firsthand. When I toured detention facilities at the border earlier this year, what I saw was entirely consistent with the news and DHS inspector general reports about the horrific and inhumane conditions there: children freezing, scared, and unsure of what would happen to them next. The children didn't know if they would ever see their parents again. Even the parents didn't know when their next meal would be, when their next shower would be, and how long they would be there. The anxiety and despair was palpable.

Amidst this crisis at the border, I placed a hold on Mr. Wolf. My requests of the Department were simple—that every child under the care of the United States of America be treated humanely. I requested that DHS hire more pediatricians for CBP facilities, that they bring on child welfare professionals to care for and provide services to the children in CBP custody, and that they increase NGO access to CBP facilities.

Regarding these specific requests, DHS has not adequately addressed the concerns. This is why I maintain my hold on Mr. Wolf's nomination and why my hold on Mr. Edgar will remain until these conditions improve.

With this in mind, we cannot allow a nominee like Mr. Wolf to move forward, especially when we know he is going to be moved right up to Acting Secretary, a position where the President can keep him indefinitely without a confirmation hearing and without the advice and consent of the Senate.

It is an end run around our constitutional role, one of the most important checks we have on the executive branch. It is also not the process we should accept for filling a Cabinet-level position in the third largest Depart-

ment in the Federal Government, one charged with the critical job of protecting our homeland.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote against cloture on Mr. Wolf's nomination tonight and against his confirmation tomorrow, and I pledge to work with all of you and the administration to identify nominees to lead the Department whom we can all support.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I rise today to ask the Senate to confirm Mr. Chad Wolf to be the Under Secretary of the Office of Strategy, Policy, and Plans at the Department of Homeland Security.

The Under Secretary of the Office of Strategy, Policy, and Plans leads an office of over 150 employees with an annual budget of over \$37 million to develop and implement DHS policy, long-term goals, and strategic plans. Chad Wolf has extensive experience in homeland security policy, starting in 2002 working as the chief of staff helping to stand up the new Transportation Security Administration after 9/11 and then as the Assistant Administrator for that agency.

He left government and spent over a decade working on homeland security policy issues as a consultant in the private sector. Mr. Wolf returned to public service and the Department of Homeland Security in 2017, serving as chief of staff at TSA, chief of staff to the Secretary, and now as the Assistant Secretary of Strategy, Plans, Analysis & Risk. Since February of this year, he has been the senior official performing the duties of the Under Secretary of the Office of Strategy, Policy, and Plans, the office for which we are now considering his nomination.

The Senate Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs approved his nomination on a bipartisan basis on July 24. As we all know, the Department has a number of Senate-confirmed leadership positions vacant. Currently, 7 of the 18 DHS offices requiring Senate confirmation are vacant. Three of those vacant positions have nominees that have been languishing on the Senate floor for months after being approved by my committee with bipartisan support.

Mr. Wolf's nomination has been pending in the Senate for almost 9 months. Troy Edgar, the nominee to be the Department's Chief Financial Officer, has been pending in the Senate for 8 months, and William Bryan, the nominee to be Under Secretary for Science and Technology, has been pending for over 4 months. All three nominees were approved by my committee with bipartisan support. We are holding a hearing to consider Mr. Peter Gaynor as the President's nominee to head FEMA this week.

Dedicated Americans serving at DHS in acting positions are doing admirable jobs under oftentimes difficult cir-

cumstances. I trust that Chad Wolf will do the same if he is asked to step aside from his role as Under Secretary to serve temporarily as Acting Secretary upon Kevin McAleenan's departure.

I fully expect and I call upon the President to nominate a permanent Secretary for the Department of Homeland Security. When he does, my committee will consider the nominee expeditiously. We need confirmed leadership at DHS to help direct the Department as it works to keep Americans safe.

We need confirmed leadership at DHS to help direct the Department as it works to keep Americans safe. I am grateful to Chad Wolf for his willingness to serve in this position, and I encourage my colleagues to support his confirmation.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, today, I rise to oppose the nomination of Chad Wolf. Officially, we are considering Mr. Wolf's nomination to serve as Under Secretary for Strategy, Policy, and Plans at the Department of Homeland Security. In that role Mr. Wolf would lead the DHS policy office, an important but little-known part of the Department.

However, that is not the role that Mr. Wolf will actually have. We have recently learned that the President has much bigger plans for Mr. Wolf. The President plans to make Mr. Wolf the next Acting Secretary for the entire Department of Homeland Security. Instead of running the policy office, which has a staff of about 160 people and an annual budget of \$35 million, Mr. Wolf will lead all of DHS, the third largest executive agency, with a 240,000-person workforce and a budget of over \$75 billion.

Let's be clear, for all intents and purposes, we are essentially about to vote on the confirmation of a new Secretary of Homeland Security, a position responsible for protecting this Nation from a vast and evolving array of threats. Despite the importance of this position and this vote, we have not been given a full opportunity to meaningfully examine Mr. Wolf's ability to take on this profoundly important and challenging role.

Based on my evaluation of his qualifications to serve as Under Secretary, I do not believe Mr. Wolf has the experience needed to lead this critical Cabinet Department.

I would like to recognize that Mr. Wolf does have several years of Homeland Security policy experience. In his

current role within the Department's policy office, Mr. Wolf has engaged in productive dialogue with the Homeland Security Committee. In particular, I have personally appreciated his willingness to recognize the growing threat of domestic terrorism and White supremacist violence and the need for the Department to do more to keep our communities safe.

However, Mr. Wolf's tenure as chief of staff to former DHS Secretary Nielsen raises serious concerns about his judgment and, in particular, his involvement in some of this administration's most misguided and harmful policies. As part of the Senate's constitutional responsibility to provide advice and consent, I have repeatedly asked DHS to provide documents directly related to Mr. Wolf's time as Secretary Nielsen's top adviser. However, the Department has failed to comply, leaving Congress without the information needed to fully and fairly evaluate Mr. Wolf's qualifications to serve as Under Secretary, let alone run the entire Department of Homeland Security.

Unfortunately, this disregard for Congress's constitutional role as a check on the executive branch is not an isolated occurrence. Instead, it appears to be a defining feature of this administration.

The Constitution requires that the President's nominees to hold key positions receive the advice and consent of the Senate. The Framers knew this arrangement was necessary to ensure that those who hold the most powerful and influential positions in government are accountable not solely to the President but to Congress and, most importantly, to the American people.

However, this President has shown a willingness to abandon the foundational principle of advice and consent and to test the limits of his legal authority to unilaterally install acting officials of his choosing. This has resulted in far too many critical positions going unfilled.

At the Department of Homeland Security, all three top positions—Secretary, Deputy Secretary, and Under Secretary for Management have been vacant for more than 7 months, and the President has yet to name a nominee for any of those roles. Other key DHS components have seen temporary leaders come and go for months—even years—without a nominee for the Senate to consider. This President has declared that he prefers “acting” officials because it “gives [him] more flexibility.”

Leadership turnover and acting officials are a part of every administration, but widespread and deliberate reliance on temporary leaders defies the constitutional principle of advice and consent, harms the Department's critical national security missions, and puts the American people at risk. The dedicated men and women at DHS who are working tirelessly to keep our country safe deserve much better. The American people deserve much better.

To his credit, I believe Mr. Wolf recognizes the untenable situation caused by the President's refusal to submit nominees to the Department's highest offices. When asked about the impact of vacancies across the top ranks of DHS, he stated “I believe having Senate-confirmed leaders in the senior levels of any cabinet agency is a benefit to the morale of the workforce and the success of the agency.”

I continue to urge the President to nominate qualified, principled leaders to lead the Department of Homeland Security. I remain committed to working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to carry out our constitutional duty to provide advice and consent by promptly, fairly, and thoroughly vetting the President's nominees. I am also committed to working across the aisle in Congress to ensure that the Department of Homeland Security has the resources and authorities it needs to keep Americans safe and to provide oversight—robust oversight—of the Department's actions and use of taxpayer dollars.

I have sought to fully and carefully weigh Mr. Wolf's qualifications for Policy Under Secretary. Unfortunately, due to the lack of transparency in Mr. Wolf's involvement in very troubling Department decisions, I cannot support his current nomination, much less his elevation to Acting Secretary.

If he is confirmed, I will do my part to support Mr. Wolf and help him be successful in an incredibly important job while also working to hold him accountable. But today, I will be voting no on his confirmation, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Chad F. Wolf, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary for Strategy, Policy, and Plans, Department of Homeland Security. (New Position).

Mitch McConnell, Roger F. Wicker, Mike Rounds, Rick Scott, John Barrasso, Kevin Cramer, Richard Burr, Steve Daines, James E. Risch, John Cornyn, John Boozman, John Hoeven, James Lankford, Todd Young, David Perdue, John Thune, Lamar Alexander.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Chad F. Wolf, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary for Strategy, Policy, and Plans, Department of Homeland Security, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

(Ms. ERNST assumed the Chair.)

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. MCSALLY). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 54, nays 40, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 353 Ex.]

YEAS—54

Alexander	Fischer	Paul
Barrasso	Gardner	Perdue
Blackburn	Graham	Portman
Blunt	Grassley	Risch
Boozman	Hawley	Roberts
Braun	Hoeven	Romney
Burr	Hyde-Smith	Rubio
Capito	Inhofe	Sasse
Cassidy	Isakson	Scott (FL)
Collins	Johnson	Scott (SC)
Cornyn	Kennedy	Shelby
Cotton	Lankford	Sinema
Cramer	Lee	Sullivan
Crapo	Manchin	Thune
Cruz	McConnell	Tillis
Daines	McSally	Toomey
Enzi	Moran	Wicker
Ernst	Murkowski	Young

NAYS—40

Baldwin	Hassan	Rosen
Bennet	Heinrich	Schatz
Blumenthal	Hirono	Schumer
Brown	Jones	Shaheen
Cantwell	Kaine	Smith
Cardin	King	Stabenow
Carper	Klobuchar	Tester
Casey	Leahy	Udall
Coons	Markey	Van Hollen
Cortez Masto	Menendez	Warner
Duckworth	Merkley	Whitehouse
Durbin	Murphy	Wyden
Feinstein	Murray	
Gillibrand	Peters	

NOT VOTING—6

Booker	Reed	Sanders
Harris	Rounds	Warren

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas 54, the nays are 40.

The motion is agreed to.

JUDICIAL CONFIRMATIONS

Ms. BLACKBURN. Madam President, over the past few months, pro-democracy protestors in Hong Kong have captivated the American consciousness with one of the most stunning mass protests in recent memory. Hong Kong people are no strangers to suppression. They are used to the censorship, digital stalking, and persecution embraced by their overlords in Beijing, and they have seen firsthand the dangers of tyranny.

Watching these protests play out got me thinking about the core values that

we as the American people share with the Hong Kong people and with so many others around the globe. There is really an interesting dichotomy at play: You can turn on the TV right now and see an entire population fighting desperately on behalf of free speech, self-expression, and the right to question their leaders' decisions.

Meanwhile, just a few countries away, the loudest voices in the newsroom are begging for just the opposite. Here in the U.S., Americans are constantly being asked if freedom is really worth the fight. Is it worth the never-ending battle to maintain it? The answer is absolutely.

When Americans look at the protests in Hong Kong, they do not see a foreign policy gray area; they see scores of revolutionaries fighting an evil regime. They identify with the disrupters, and they cheer for the underdogs who do not pull their punches, which is why, in 2016, they sent a disrupter to the White House.

They watch the hysteria that is cable news commentary and get the sense that the people on the screen have completely missed the point. The fight is not and never will be about one person or one movement. It is about the decision to protect liberty or to let liberty die; to protect justice or to let it die. To dismiss this point is to disparage the most important feature of the collaborative American psyche. When asked if freedom is worth fighting for, the answer will always be yes.

The calculus flows into discussions on almost every aspect of American life. Most recently, at home and in this Chamber, debate has centered on the ideological makeup of the Federal judiciary. We have repeatedly asked ourselves: Will the judges we are confirming respect and protect the core values of the American people? The answer is yes, they absolutely will.

This is not the first time the American public has swung back around to consider our "first principles." We talked about them in the early 90s and again—perhaps more passionately—in the early 2000s. Last week, I was fortunate enough to attend an event at the White House celebrating our success in confirming well-qualified, constitutional judges to the Federal bench. We have filled 158 vacancies since 2017, and we are far from done.

I am sure, however, that my friends in the minority wish we would give it a rest, but we won't. After all, they have had to work overtime trying to convince the American people that our job is to impose by judicial decree policies that were rejected at the ballot box. They want to do this without the benefit of legislative debate or public comment, which means that confirming constitutional judges is far from being in their best interest.

So here they come, insisting that "constitutionalism" is a dog whistle for racism, sexism, homophobia, and holding regressive and extreme ideas.

What a ridiculous strategy. The bipartisan nominees this body has con-

firmed proved they are capable of resisting the urge to get creative with the law when it suits the loudest voices in the room. Instead, they apply the same foresight employed by the Founding Fathers. These judges know that permitting the government more powers to mold and manipulate society will give rise to a government that will never resist the temptation to overstep its bounds.

Our courts are not courts of public opinion, and my friends in the minority would do well to remember the cost of treating them as such. Constitutionalism is our legacy and our inheritance. I urge my colleagues to remember this because we are going to vote to confirm judges who have proven themselves committed to defending our core values and the rule of law in the United States of America.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that I be recognized as in morning business for such time as I use.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection.

CHINA

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, I am here today to talk about an important vote that I took 19 years ago, a vote about free trade from China. Now, you might say it is a little out of character, coming down to the floor and talking about free trade and China, because normally I am down here talking about how China is investing in their military at unprecedented rates or how they are passing us up in terms of our military, which we saw in the last administration.

The reality is that when it comes to China—which is entirely controlled by a tyrannical Communist party—you cannot separate their trade behavior from their military like you can in a democratic government. China asserts its power both economically and militarily to the detriment of the free world.

So 19 years ago, I came down to the Senate floor and took a stand against the tyrannical regime in China. The vote was on whether or not to allow the Chinese Government normalized trade relationships with the United States that would pave the way for China to join the World Trade Organization.

At that time, it was not popular—it was not popular for any Member of the Senate who stood in the way of free trade agreements, much less a Republican. But as I saw it then, the vote did much more than open up trade. It granted favors to an authoritarian regime, despite their openly predatory actions, without demanding concessions in return. My colleagues claimed that opening China to free trade would cause China to change their behavior. Clearly, that did not happen, but I will get to that in a minute.

Filled with the false hope and empty promises, the trade agreement sailed

through the Senate, 83 to 15, and was signed by then-President Clinton. Now, I am the only one of those 15 "no" votes still serving in the United States Senate. Today, 19 years later, we have seen the reality of what I thought would happen. At the time, I said—and I am quoting from my speech 19 years ago—"We cannot allow the pursuit of dollars to blind us to certain realities about the ruling communist regime in China, including"—keep in mind, I am going to read all eight of these that I had mentioned 19 years ago—"repeated threats against the United States and Taiwan"—still going on today; "massive military modernization and buildup"—still going on; "proliferation of dangerous weapons to rogue states. Theft of U.S. nuclear secrets"—still going on; "demonstrated strategy to exploit commercial relationships to acquire advanced military technology," that is still going on today; "attempts to corrupt the U.S. political system. Violation of international agreements. Brutal repression of dissidents." We know that is happening.

I continued: "To ignore these actions in the belief that they can be separated from what we do in our trading relationship is dangerously misguided. China's trade surpluses are helping to finance the regime's military buildup and aggressive foreign policy, while strengthening its hold on economic and political power."

I do not take any pride in being right, because the outcome has been devastating for the American workers. China has stolen our technology and personnel secrets and taken millions of U.S. jobs over the past two decades. The facts today show it.

Let's go through quickly a few of what we predicted two decades ago and see where we are today. First, the threats against the United States and Taiwan, that is pretty clear. Just look at China's reaction to the recent routine arms sale to Taiwan of tanks and Stinger missiles. Keep in mind, China has known since 1979 that we sell arms to Taiwan to aid in their self-defense. Everyone knows that.

They threatened that they were prepared to go to war to defend their "unity and territorial integrity"—over a routine arms sale. In the past year alone, Beijing has frequently threatened to use force against any who opposed the Communist Party's designs on Taiwan, so despite free trade, China has not stopped their threatening behavior toward the United States and Taiwan.

Secondly, massive military modernization and buildup. We know that is still going on. It is obvious to everyone that China has not changed their behavior on this because of free trade. It has emboldened them. China has become more aggressive as our free trade system has subsidized their economy.

Some key facts: Over the last decade, the Chinese Government has grown their military spending—look at the chart when I read this—has grown their

military spending by 83 percent. That is over the last decade. Meanwhile, during the last 5 years of the Obama administration, we decreased our military spending by 25 percent. We decreased our military spending while China had increased theirs by 83 percent.

That is why, today, China is able to build ships at a faster rate than we are and is on pace to surpass the number of vessels by 2030. That is why China is investing heavily in cyber capabilities, aviation, artillery, and hypersonic weapons—hypersonic weapons, the most sophisticated new weapons they have, the weapons that move at five times the speed of sound. Actually, before the Obama administration, we were ahead of both China and Russia. At the end of that administration, we are behind them, and we are catching up now. Each capability, if not superior to ours, has the potential to do us significant harm.

In 2018, I visited our allies in Southeast Asia, where I saw the Chinese military buildup in the South China Sea for myself.

You remember the islands they created. This is not taking over territory; it is creating territory because those islands weren't there. They have islands in the South China Sea. The Chinese, at last count, I believe, were at seven islands. When you go in and look at it, you become convinced they are preparing for a world war III.

China, prior to that time—this is only 3 years ago—had always done their military in their home territory. It has always been in China until they went in Djibouti—that is the northern part of Africa—and they started their own activity there. Now they are all the way down to Tanzania, in that part of the world.

The Department of Defense official expects the Chinese to open more bases, too, in the Middle East, in China, in Southeast Asia, and in the Pacific. They are all strategically important locations.

When I talked to our allies in the Pacific, they are concerned, and many are beginning to hedge their bets because they see what China is doing. We are talking about the South China Sea. We are talking about our own allies who have historically been our allies. All of a sudden, they are starting to have second thoughts. They are seeing what China is doing, but they don't see us doing anything. After 8 years of President Obama's weak leadership, it is getting more difficult for us to prove to them that we are actually interested in standing up to China's aggression.

Third, the theft of U.S. secrets—we know about that. There is an old saying: What China doesn't have, it steals. That is even more apparent today than it was in 2000. China is still actively pursuing and stealing some of our most valuable military secrets. Just last year, China hacked a Navy contractor and stole massive amounts of classified data. That practice isn't new, but it is

still having serious impacts on our ability to get ahead of China's militarily.

We are seeing an alarming rise in how China steals industrial secrets. They do it out in the open—for example, by forcing any American business that wants to operate in China to form a partnership with a Chinese business. They have been doing that for a long period of time, and we have been going along with it. Sadly, these partnerships are nothing more than a way for the Chinese Communist Party to access and steal proprietary ideas and technology.

They also do it in nefarious ways—through exploiting educational relationships on college campuses or stealing biomedical research during the peer-review process.

This is no small thing. One in five American companies has been a victim of Chinese intellectual property theft. That matters because nearly 80 percent of our economy is based on intangibles—the very things the Chinese are stealing.

It is safe to say that this is another area where the regime in Beijing has been emboldened by free trade at the expense of American innovation and economic growth.

China hasn't changed its position on exploiting commercial relationships either. For the past two decades, China has taken advantage of countries—weaponizing their debt and working to control ports, infrastructure, and other territory, posing a very real threat to U.S. interests. There is no place where this is more apparent than in Africa, where I keep hearing: "America will tell you what you need; China will build it for you." Of course, they don't follow through and talk about how they use all Chinese resources to do this. They use Chinese labor. But it is of no value to Africa.

I have been to Africa probably more than any other Member, as I have been very active in that area and have seen some of the threats that face us on that continent, and I have seen the Chinese debt trap hobble more promising governments.

But it goes far beyond the developing world and extends right into our own backyard. Just look at the recent issue with the NBA, where the general manager of the Houston Rockets tweeted a message in support of the Hong Kong protesters. The backlash was swift. China stopped airing Rockets games or streaming them online, and their online retailers pulled merchandise from online stores.

We have also seen U.S. hotels, aviation companies—even the Gap—being forced to edit and self-censor to remove any reference that even tangentially refers to Taiwan, Tibet, or Hong Kong not being a part of the People's Republic of China, all to appease the Communist Party. The jewelry company Tiffany was pressured to remove an advertisement of a woman covering her eye because images of a protester in

Hong Kong with a wounded eye got international attention.

We live in a democracy, and we don't dictate to private businesses what they should or should not do. This is not the case in China. Yet, if we continue down the road of self-censorship, the party's demands will escalate, and it will be harder and harder to exercise freedom of expression.

Fourth, lastly, brutal repression of dissidents—that was true 19 years ago, and it is true today. More than anything, I would like to say this was an area where free trade had forced the Chinese Communist Party to change its behavior. That is what we were all told would happen, but it didn't happen. We know it is not true.

We all know about the atrocities that are going on in Xinjiang Province, where the government is forcing a Muslim minority into concentration camps, although they call them reeducation centers. We all know what is going on in Hong Kong, where Beijing is repressing a democratic demonstration with brutal tactics. I remember being in Hong Kong at the time China reasserted what they call their leadership, their ownership, to Hong Kong. It has been on and off all these years. Right now, that effort—disagreement is still taking place.

Outside of the areas that, despite China's best efforts, have attracted international attention, we still know about the atrocities the Chinese Communist Party quietly inflicts on journalists and Christian minorities in house churches and in communities across China every day.

I have just painted a very bleak picture of U.S.-China relations and how unrestricted trade didn't force the ruling party in Beijing to change its behavior, but the good news is, help is finally on the way. After the trade deal was enacted—I am talking about President Trump's trade deal—I kept speaking out against the Chinese Communist Party, calling attention to their human rights abuses, their military buildup, their manipulative trade tactics, and their economic bullying. I pushed every President until now to stand up to the economic powerhouse before it was too late and they outmatched us. I tried that with Republicans and Democrats alike, and it didn't work.

Now we have the first President since 2000 to take China seriously. President Trump is clear-eyed about the regime in Beijing. He knows that our trade relations have been unfair and imbalanced, and he understands that we need real and permanent fixes in order to have any long-term stability. This is something that has been going on for a long period of time, and he is now changing this. He is getting criticized, obviously.

I have to say this: It hurts our farmers in the State of Oklahoma. However, I would say that they are very understanding that someone is finally willing to take on China.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

He has effectively applied tariffs, both to punish the Chinese Government for its manipulative trade practices and also to support critical industries in the United States.

The result: China's economy has slowed to its lowest point since 1992—and that is if you believe their official numbers. These are their numbers. It has slowed down their economy. That has not happened before.

The economic pressure brought them to the table, ready to make a real deal—one that is fair and accountable. So far, we have gotten phase 1—a preliminary first deal—and the outcome is good for farmers in Oklahoma and across the country. For the first time, China has agreed to purchase \$40 billion to \$50 billion worth of American agricultural goods. That would be the highest level since 2012. That is a good start.

The fight against China's economic manipulation and influence is not over. It can't just be limited to shrinking the trade deficit through greater purchases of American goods. Future parts of any agreement need to be sure to address the concerns that Presidents of both parties neglected for decades, including theft of intellectual property and industrial secrets, forced technology transfer, reciprocal access to markets, and subsidies to China's state-owned enterprises.

All of this needs to be placed into the proper context of the Communist Party's ambitions on the world stage: to rewrite the rules of the international system, to make the world safe for authorities to suppress democracy and abuse human rights, and to achieve global military superiority by midcentury.

President Trump's stand against China on trade has provoked a lot of discussion about our competition with China. We have to remember that this is not a competition against China but a competition for influence—the kind of influence that decides what kind of world our kids and grandkids are going to live in. Next week, my wife and I will be celebrating our 60th wedding anniversary. We have 20 kids and grandkids. They are the ones who will be living in that world I just described.

In this competition, we can't afford to be naive. The Chinese Communist Party has a very different version of the world it would like to create, so even as we keep talking about the tariffs, we have to remember that our values are still America's most precious commodity. It is our values—free people and truly free markets—that must guide us in the competition ahead.

Every part of this speech I gave on the Senate floor 19 years ago has become a reality, and President Trump knows this. Maybe we better listen to him.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Madam President, I am going to yield the floor.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to legislative session and be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SMALL REFINERY WAIVERS AND ETHANOL

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, on behalf of the corn and soybean farmers in my State, I object to "small refinery relief language" in the fiscal year 2020 Interior appropriations bill that suggests that the Environmental Protection Agency, EPA, disregard Department of Energy determinations on small refinery hardships. The provision encourages EPA to continue allowing refiners to stop blending biofuels with no transparency or evidence of hardship.

Fourteen years ago in this Chamber, I helped enact the renewable fuels standard, RFS, which required petroleum-based vehicle fuels to include a minimum volume of ethanol and biodiesel in them. Both fuels are produced from corn and soybeans, driving economic activity throughout Illinois and the Midwest.

The law has been a tremendous success. We have created new markets for corn and soybeans and helped supply motorists with affordable fuel. We have provided a greener alternative to MTBE and other additives. And now the United States is the world's largest producer of ethanol, generating commerce and creating jobs, both on and off the farm.

In fact, I can hardly think of a national policy in this generation that has achieved greater success for rural economic growth than biofuels. In the wake of the gasoline shortages of the 1970s, the farm financial crisis of the 1980s, the clean air discussions of the 1990s, the oil price spikes of the 2000s, and rural economic conditions of today, biofuels became part of the solution. For more than 40 years, farmers and policymakers built an industry unique to the heartland of this country.

Yet in just 2 years, President Trump has wrestled American biofuels to its knees. He singlehandedly has delivered one crippling blow after another. Each action he has taken contributes to the gradual dismantling of this enterprise. With his involvement, or outright neglect, ethanol prices, profits, and blending are the lowest in history, and thousands of rural jobs have been lost.

The President claims his support for ethanol and biodiesel is strong. I say: believe it when you see it. Because when this President issues declarations of victory on biofuels, facilities stay shuttered and the markets stay stalled.

Congressional frustration on this topic is bipartisan and growing, although some farm State lawmakers and interests still stare at their shoes while a President who shares their political affiliation burns this industry to the ground. Long after the alarm bells were ringing and klaxons were sounding, those who should have known better at the outset, whose earlier responses were accolades, now find themselves at path's end, hoodwinked.

As a member of the Senate Agriculture Committee, I pressed the EPA to approve E15, a 15 percent blend of ethanol in gasoline, for year-round sales as soon as possible. And I applauded that final decision in June. For Illinois, E15 could boost 14 ethanol facilities and 20,000 downstate jobs. For motorists, E15 could save up to 10 cents per gallon.

But pull back the curtain, and the President has allowed EPA to issue 85 secret waivers that allow oil refineries to stop blending biofuels into gasoline. Economists have confirmed that shatters demand for E15. Waivers mean that E15 is a fake victory by President Trump.

After increasing pressure and outcry, on October 4, President Trump publicized an agreement ostensibly designed to restore the lost ethanol demand caused by his waivers back to the 15 billion gallon floor—even 16 billion gallons, claimed the President. Ten days later, the Trump administration stunned observers by publishing details that watered down these numbers and slashed the ethanol deal by half, while stakeholders were coached that nothing has changed.

The language in the Interior appropriations bill suggests that EPA continue to thumb its nose at corn and soybean producers while issuing small oil refinery waivers. Meanwhile, Big Oil is doing just fine. In May, the Department of Energy reported that net income for top U.S. oil companies like Exxon and Chevron has totaled \$28 billion, the most profitable in five years. For farmers, however, net income has plummeted 50 percent from its record highs during the Obama administration.

For years, farmers and policymakers of multiple backgrounds and persuasions have come together, in good faith, to carefully build a new industry that benefits consumers, farmers, and rural residents. This pioneering innovation is rooted in the heritage of rural values, all in jeopardy of crumbling because the void between this President's words and acts.

I urge my colleagues to work to support rural America by ending EPA's efforts to issue these waivers without any concern for transparency or economic impact.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I support the sentiments of my colleague from Illinois in objecting to the "small refinery relief" language in the fiscal year 2020 Interior appropriations bill. In the past, this language has been invoked by the Trump administration's

Environmental Protection Agency, EPA, to disregard the Department of Energy's recommendations regarding small refinery hardships under the renewable fuel standard, RFS, and waive additional gallons of renewable fuels from our fuel supply. These actions, permitted by President Trump, hurt rural America and our farmers.

The RFS is an important driver of Michigan jobs and our bio-based economy. This Administration's continued abuse of refinery waivers undermine the integrity of the RFS program and hurt our farmers, biofuel producers, and rural communities in Michigan and across the country. I strongly oppose this report language and encourage my colleagues to support rural America's interests by calling to end the Trump administration's abuse of small refinery exemptions.

Ms. SMITH. Mr. President, I would like to add my support to the statement given by my colleague from Illinois. On behalf of the corn and soybean farmers in my State and on behalf of the biofuel industry in my State, I strongly oppose the "small refinery relief" language in the fiscal year 2020 Interior appropriations bill. This "relief language" will allow the EPA to continue to exempt refiners from blending biofuels without any evidence of actual hardship.

Small refinery waivers from the EPA are wreaking havoc on our Nation's rural economy. Across the country, ethanol plants and biodiesel plants are halting production or being forced to shut down. These biofuel plants often are the local cornerstone of the community, supporting thousands of rural jobs across the country, and serving as important markets for farmers to process millions of bushels of corn, soybeans, and other commodities. Farmers are struggling after years of low prices, extreme weather and a chaotic trade agenda, and instead of providing certainty and relief for our farmers, this administration chose to destroy more markets and further harm rural communities.

The problems caused by small-refinery waiver abuse are seen across the upper Midwest, but they hit the agricultural communities in my state of Minnesota particularly hard. Two months ago, the Corn Plus ethanol plant in Winnebago closed. When I traveled there, I talked to farmers and community members and heard directly about how the loss of that facility will impact their lives. The Corn Plus plant closed, but throughout Minnesota ethanol plants are idling and cutting back, impacting workers and hurting local farmers. For example, a recent Renewable Fuels Association analysis of the impact of idling at the Green Plains plant in Fairmont, MN, found that local corn prices were reduced, leading to an \$8.4 million loss for local farmers who typically sell to the plant.

Last week, Tim Rudnicki, executive director for the Minnesota Bio-Fuels

Association traveled to Michigan to testify at the EPA public hearing on their wholly inadequate Trump administration proposed "fix" to the waiver abuse problems. In Mr. Rudnicki's remarks, he said that the current EPA is "driving renewable biofuels backwards and toward the cliff." I couldn't agree more. This has to stop, and Congress needs to make it stop because it has become clear that the current Administration has put big oil ahead of our farmers and our rural communities.

In the wake of the EPA's continued efforts to undercut the integrity of the RFS by misusing its waiver authority, I urge my colleagues to support this country's rural communities by ending the EPA's abuse of the small refinery exemptions.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I join my colleagues today in expressing my opposition to the language in the fiscal year 2020 Interior appropriations bill related to the Environmental Protection Agency's ability to issue small refinery waivers under the renewable fuel standard without taking into account the Department of Energy's recommendations.

The Trump administration continues to undermine the renewable fuel standard by granting small refinery waivers to multi-billion-dollar oil companies. Since the beginning of the administration, a total of 85 waivers have been issued, reducing demand for more than 4 billion gallons of renewable fuel. That is why I have repeatedly called on the Trump administration to stop issuing any further waivers, immediately reallocate the remaining gallons, and make public the information regarding any recipients of these exemptions.

We need more transparency and openness about the Environmental Protection Agency's, EPA, use of small refinery waivers—who is applying for and receiving them, how are they documenting their economic hardship, and how is EPA considering that hardship in the context of interagency recommendations. The "small refinery relief" provision in the appropriations bill will allow EPA to avoid answering these questions and continue issuing waivers without providing evidence of hardship.

It is for this reason that I am opposed to the "small refinery relief" language in the fiscal year 2020 Interior appropriations bill. While the administration must cease issuing any further improper refinery exemptions, as I have been calling for since these abuses began, we can start supporting our farmers and rural communities by removing this harmful provision from the Interior appropriations bill during conference negotiations. Especially at a time when they are facing trade uncertainty, low prices, and difficult weather, our farmers deserve better.

IMMIGRATION

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, today the Supreme Court heard arguments in

one of the most consequential immigration cases in modern American history. The future of more than 700,000 DACA recipients—our Nation's Dreamers—hangs in the balance and their fate is inherently intertwined with the fate of the American Dream itself.

Dreamers, by definition, are law-abiding immigrants brought to the United States as children—through no choice of their own—now simply seeking the chance to contribute to the only country they have ever known as home. Dreamers, by definition, do not pose any kind of public safety or national security threat. They are our neighbors, our first responders, our defenders, and our teachers. Nearly a thousand Dreamers serve in our Armed Forces, risking their lives to preserve the freedoms of millions of American citizens. Dreamers are Americans in every way, except on paper. Americans know this, and have roundly rejected the baseless, un-American vitriol spread by President Trump—yet again this morning, just hours before the argument—that some Dreamers are "hardened criminals."

So it is no wonder that the overwhelming majority of Americans support providing legal protections to our Nation's Dreamers. And it is no surprise that leaders of industry in every major sector of our economy have called for providing legal status and a path to citizenship for Dreamers, recognizing their enormous contributions to our economy.

The depth of opposition to President Trump's decision to heartlessly terminate DACA is matched only by the breadth of agreement among courts that the Trump administration is just plain wrong on the law. Five out of six Federal courts that considered the Trump administration's effort to end DACA blocked President Trump from actually doing so and they have rejected the Trump administration's laughable argument that its decision to end DACA is simply unreviewable by the courts.

I am hopeful that the Supreme Court sides with the near unanimous consensus among lower courts. I am hopeful that it joins the united chorus of Americans who envision a legally protected place in our society for this group of immigrants that embodies the American dream.

Regardless of how the Supreme Court rules, Congress is by no means a bystander. Congress still has the authority and the responsibility to do what is right. Just a few months ago, the House passed a bipartisan bill, the American Dream and Promise Act, which would enact critical protections for Dreamers and provide temporary safe haven to targeted groups of immigrants whose home countries have been crippled by natural disasters or civil conflict. The Senate could easily take up this bill today or it could take up the bipartisan Senate bill, the Dream Act of 2019, authored by Senators GRAHAM and DURBIN, which would provide

meaningful safeguards to our Dreamers. Either way, Senate inaction is simply not acceptable to the millions of Americans in both parties who see the prospect of mass deportations of Dreamers as antithetical to who we are as the United States of America.

As we wait for our Nation's highest Court to rule on this case, it is essential for Americans to express their views about the future of Dreamers to their elected representatives. This case, after all, is not just about the specific Dreamers who would benefit from DACA's continued existence, and it not just about the Trump administration's anti-immigrant impulses and policies. This is about whether our proud past as a nation of immigrants and refugees—a country that became one out of many—has a bright future. That future should not be left solely to the courts nor should it be left to language in Majority Leader McCONNELL's legislative graveyard. This future will be shaped, in part, by what we choose to do now, in the present and it is beyond time for the Senate to come together and do what is right.

(At the request of Mr. SCHUMER following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.)

VOTE EXPLANATION

• Mr. REED. Madam President, I was unavoidably absent for the vote this evening due to a delayed flight. Had I been present, I would have voted no on cloture on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 87, Chad F. Wolf to be Under Secretary for Strategy, Policy, and Plans, Department of Homeland Security.●

REMEMBERING KAY HAGAN

Mr. ISAKSON. Madam President, today I would like to remember in the RECORD former U.S. Senator Kay Hagan of North Carolina.

Senator Hagan and I served together on the Senate Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, where she served both North Carolina and the United States well during her years in the Senate. We also worked together closely on housing issues affecting Americans as a result of the 2008 economic downturn and housing crisis.

Kay and I served as Senate coleaders of the annual Congressional Civil Rights Pilgrimage to historic sites of the civil rights movement in Alabama in 2013. I was honored to have her by my side along with U.S. Representative JOHN LEWIS of Georgia during this moving event, which culminated with an emotional crossing of the Edmund Pettus Bridge in Selma, where Congressman LEWIS was beaten during the 1965 march he led there. Upon return, Senator Hagan wrote about the moment Montgomery chief of police Kevin Murphy personally apologized to Congressman LEWIS on behalf of the Montgomery Police Department for the department's failure to protect the Free-

dom Riders while removing his police badge and presenting it to Congressman LEWIS. She shared how this experience served as an emotional reminder to her of the oath she took to protect and serve the people of North Carolina.

That was how Kay worked. That trip, along with our legislative efforts together in Washington, cemented the high respect I have had for her and her work on many issues affecting the Southeast.

I honor of Kay Hagan, I was proud to cosponsor a Senate resolution saluting her life and service.

I also hope she would have appreciated our vote to advance the Kay Hagan Tick Act in the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee. My older sister died at a very young age from the fatal results of a tick bite, and it was tragic to see Senator Hagan succumb to complications of the tickborne Powassan virus. This legislation was named for her to improve research, prevention, diagnostics and treatment for tick-borne diseases.

I appreciate her service to the country, and my prayers are with Chip, her family and all those who loved her. Her legacy will live on.

TRIBUTE TO STAFF SERGEANT DANIEL P. KELLER

Mr. PAUL. Madam President, I want to recognize the accomplishments of SSgt Daniel P. Keller for his heroic actions while in combat in Afghanistan. On 16 August 2017, while assigned as a joint terminal attack controller for Combined Joint Special Operations Air Component Afghanistan, Staff Sergeant Keller performed his duty to his country and his teammates with fierce determination and unquestionable courage.

While on a mission, his assault force struck an improvised explosive device and came under heavy fire from the enemy. Despite being wounded, Staff Sergeant Keller used his most potent weapon, the ability to call in airpower, to strike enemy positions while simultaneously returning fire with his personal weapon. Most admirably, Staff Sergeant Keller took direct action to ensure the successful evacuation of 13 critically wounded casualties while under continuous enemy fire. Upon saving his wounded comrades, Staff Sergeant Keller continued to engage the enemy and guaranteed follow-on forces were well prepared to continue the fight.

For his valiant service, Staff Sergeant Keller received the Air Force Cross, our Nation's second highest medal for combat valor. His citation for this award stated that "his personal courage, quick actions and tactical expertise whilst under fire directly contributed to the survival of the 130 members of his assault force, including 31 wounded in action."

I would like to offer my most profound appreciation to Staff Sergeant Keller for his willingness to go above

and beyond the call of duty to ensure his mission while saving American lives. His courage and dedication should serve as an example to us all and remind us of our solemn duty to the men and women who volunteer to defend our great Nation.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO NANCY J. FLETCHER

• Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I rise to offer a tribute to Nancy J. Fletcher, a long-serving chief executive of a respected national trade association whose leadership has benefited Oklahoma and the Nation.

Nancy Fletcher led the Outdoor Advertising Association of America, now known as the Out of Home Advertising Association of America, for nearly 30 years as president and CEO.

An attorney, Ms. Fletcher shares my deep respect for property rights, as spelled out in the takings clause of the Fifth Amendment: private property shall not be taken for public use without just compensation.

Ahead of Ms. Fletcher's retirement, I recall some of her important contributions to the Nation and to Oklahoma. After the terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001, Ms. Fletcher and her colleagues in the industry immediately posted messages of national unity and resolve.

During her long leadership, technology changed all types of media, including out of home media. As some billboards were converted to digital electronic displays, Ms. Fletcher pioneered partnerships with law enforcement, emergency managers, and the National Center for Missing & Exploited Children. These partnerships, including with the National Weather Center in Norman, have had positive benefits for communicating emergency services, featuring tip lines to locate fugitives and share information to help missing children return home.

Please join me in extending congratulations to Nancy Fletcher for her successful leadership of the Outdoor Advertising Association of America and her contributions to the public good.●

50TH ANNIVERSARY OF ALABAMA AGRICULTURAL & MECHANICAL UNIVERSITY

• Mr. JONES. Madam President, I rise today to recognize Alabama Agricultural & Mechanical University, AAMU on their 50th anniversary as a university. As an 1890 land-grant institution and one of Alabama's 14 historically Black colleges and universities, HBCUs, Alabama A&M has long upheld a legacy of impressive scholarship and service. It is an honor to celebrate the achievements of an institution of such importance to my State.

Alabama A&M first opened its doors on May 1, 1875, as the Huntsville Normal School following its founding by a

former slave, Dr. William Hooper Council. With just \$1,000 in annual appropriations, 61 students, and 2 instructors in its first year, the institution evolved throughout multiple iterations of its 144-year history into what it is today. Due to its success with industrial education and private funding from the Slater and Peabody Funds, the Alabama Legislature authorized a name change to the "State Normal and Industrial School in Huntsville." In 1891, the school became a recipient of the Federal land-grant fund in order to further fund training in agricultural and mechanical arts at the college level. Following several name changes and a location move from Huntsville to Normal, AL, the school became a junior college in 1919 under the name "The State Agricultural and Mechanical Institute for Negroes." Twenty years later, the school was permitted by the State board of education to offer work at a senior college level. In 1941, the first graduation class since 1920 received bachelor degrees. The school became a fully accredited member of the association in 1963, following a "Class A" rating by the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools in 1946. Alabama Agricultural and Mechanical University received its final name on June 26, 1969, per a resolution from the Alabama State Board of Education.

The campus, situated on The Hill near downtown Huntsville, has received visits from 19 Nobel laureates. Students at AAMU have access to advanced degree programs including Ph.D. degrees in applied physics, food science, plant and soil science, and reading and literacy. Alabama A&M University is one of the leading producers of African Americans with PhDs in physics.

AAMU has also graduated many notable alumni from star athletes, to world class entertainers, to leaders and pioneers in the civil rights movement. Jearl Miles-Clark, an Olympic Gold medalist who competed in the 400 and 800 meter races and the 400 meter relay, graduated from AAMU in 1989. NFL legend, John Stallworth, played football at AAMU and was an All-Southern Intercollegiate Athletic Conference receiver in 1972 and 1973 before joining the NFL as a wide receiver for the Pittsburgh Steelers. Stallworth went on to compete in four Super Bowls and was inducted into the Pro Football Hall of Fame in 2002. American Idol winner and popular R&B artist Ruben Studdard received a football scholarship to attend AAMU, where he majored in music education. Joseph Lowery, a United Methodist minister and leader in the civil rights movement, also attended AAMU. Lowery later succeeded Martin Luther King, Jr. as the third president of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference. Vivian Malone Jones, one of the first two Black students to enroll at the

University of Alabama, earned her first bachelor's degree from AAMU in business education. She later went on to receive the first bachelor's degree awarded by the University of Alabama to a Black student, following her study of business management. These are only a handful of the remarkable scholars and activists, AAMU has had a hand in educating and training.

Under the leadership of its 11th president, Dr. Andrew Hugine, Jr., the university comprises over 70 buildings on more than 1,000 acres, is home to more than 6,000 students, is a designated "Gold Military Friendly" institution and serves as a regional, State, national, and international resource while maintaining its mission of educating the underserved and uplifting the people of Alabama, the Nation, and the world through excellence in education.

Please join me in celebrating Alabama A&M on this auspicious occasion and wishing both their students, faculty, and administrators future success in all of their endeavors for another 50 years.●

RECOGNIZING MAC'S VACS

● Mr. RISCH. Madam President, as a member and former chairman of the Senate Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, each month I recognize and celebrate the American entrepreneurial spirit by highlighting the success of a small business in my home State of Idaho. However, in honor of Veterans Day on November 11, this month I will honor a veteran-owned small business for each of the 10 days the Senate is in legislative session. The personal sacrifices made by America's veterans have protected the very freedoms and values that give each of us and our children the ability to achieve the American dream. The skills veterans learn as members of the military are invaluable and undoubtedly contribute to Idaho's flourishing veteran business community. I am proud of the sacrifices veterans have made to protect our country and that they are choosing Idaho to call home when they complete their service in the military.

As your U.S. Senator from the great State of Idaho, it is my pleasure to recognize Mac's Vacs in Lewiston as the Idaho Small Business of the Day for November 12, 2019. Mac's Vacs was founded in 1950 and is owned and operated by U.S. Air Force veteran Dennis Prine. The company first opened in a garage and has since moved into a local storefront in the same neighborhood. After serving in the Air Force, Prine acquired Mac's Vacs in the 1980s and has expanded and improved its services since.

Mac's Vacs offers a variety of appliance services for customers, including vacuum sales and service, central vacuum systems, commercial chemicals,

and more. Prine even offers technical assistance through a YouTube channel. The company's mission to provide quality products, knowledge, and service to customers has proven fundamental to the success of the business.

Congratulations to Dennis Prine and all of the employees at Mac's Vacs for being selected as the Veteran-owned Idaho Small Business of the Day for November 12, 2019. You make our great State proud, and I look forward to your continued growth and success.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Ms. Roberts, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

In executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

PRESIDENTIAL MESSAGES

REPORT RELATIVE TO THE CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY THAT WAS ORIGINALLY DECLARED IN EXECUTIVE ORDER 12938 OF NOVEMBER 14, 1994, WITH RESPECT TO THE PROLIFERATION OF WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION—PM 36

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days before the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice, stating that the national emergency with respect to the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction that was declared in Executive Order 12938 of November 14, 1994, is to continue in effect beyond November 14, 2019.

DONALD J. TRUMP.
THE WHITE HOUSE, November 12, 2019.

REPORT RELATIVE TO THE CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY THAT WAS ORIGINALLY DECLARED IN EXECUTIVE ORDER 12170 OF NOVEMBER 14, 1979, WITH RESPECT TO IRAN—PM 37

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days before the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency with respect to Iran declared in Executive Order 12170 of November 14, 1979, is to continue in effect beyond November 14, 2019.

Our relations with Iran have not yet normalized, and the process of implementing the agreements with Iran, dated January 19, 1981, is ongoing. For this reason, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared in Executive Order 12170 with respect to Iran.

DONALD J. TRUMP.

THE WHITE HOUSE, November 12, 2019.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bill was read the first time:

S. 2840. A bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, and for other purposes.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSON, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 1877. A bill to establish procedures and consequences in the event of a failure to complete regular appropriations (Rept. No. 116-158).

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Ms. ROSEN (for herself and Mr. BARRASSO):

S. 2830. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend the period under

which an election must be made for entitlement to educational assistance under the All-Volunteer Educational Assistance Program of the Department of Veterans Affairs, to phase out the use of such program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. CAPITO (for herself and Ms. SINEMA):

S. 2831. A bill to amend title 51, United States Code, to modify the national space grant college and fellowship program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 2832. A bill to assist those subject to politically motivated charges in Turkey, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. MERKLEY (for himself, Mr. BROWN, Mr. REED, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

S. 2833. A bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act to extend the consumer credit protections provided to members of the Armed Forces and their dependents under title 10, United States Code, to all consumers; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. SULLIVAN (for himself and Ms. HIRONO):

S. 2834. A bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act to exclude extensions of credit made to veterans from the definition of a member business loan; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Ms. ROSEN (for herself and Mr. ROBERTS):

S. 2835. A bill to include information regarding VA home loans in the Informed Consumer Choice Disclosure required to be provided to a prospective FHA borrower who is a veteran, to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the provision of a certificate of eligibility for VA home loans during the preseparation counseling for members of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mrs. MURRAY (for herself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. HASSAN, Ms. HIRONO, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. BROWN, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. WARREN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. KAINE, Mr. BENNET, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. SMITH, Ms. STABENOW, and Mr. CARDIN):

S. 2836. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of Health and Human Services from taking any action to implement, enforce, or otherwise give effect to the final rule, entitled "Protecting Statutory Conscience Rights in Health Care; Delegations of Authority"; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. WARREN, Mr. KING, Mr. MERKLEY, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 2837. A bill to amend title 51, United States Code, to require a National Aeronautics and Space Administration initiative on reduction of greenhouse gas emissions and noise emissions from aircraft, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Ms. ERNST, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. SULLIVAN, Ms. MURKOWSKI, and Mr. PERDUE):

S. 2838. A bill to amend the Ted Stevens Olympic and Amateur Sports Act to improve the transparency of the United States Center

for Safe Sport, to provide grant accountability, and to protect victims of abuse from retaliation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

S. 2839. A bill to amend the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 to regulate industrial bank holding companies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. INHOFE:

S. 2840. A bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, and for other purposes; read the first time.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. MURPHY:

S. Res. 417. A resolution commemorating the 81st anniversary of Kristallnacht, or the Night of Broken Glass; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN (for herself, Mr.

VAN HOLLEN, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. KAINE, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. RUBIO, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. Res. 418. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate regarding the Government of Turkey's crackdown on dissent related to its incursion into northeast Syria, and broader human rights violations; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. TESTER (for himself and Mr. ISAKSON):

S. Res. 419. A resolution permitting the collection of clothing, toys, food, and housewares during the holiday season for charitable purposes in Senate buildings; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 225

At the request of Mr. ISAKSON, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 225, a bill to provide for partnerships among State and local governments, regional entities, and the private sector to preserve, conserve, and enhance the visitor experience at nationally significant battlefields of the American Revolution, War of 1812, and Civil War, and for other purposes.

S. 433

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 433, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve home health payment reforms under the Medicare program.

S. 457

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 457, a bill to require that \$1 coins issued during 2019 honor President George H.W. Bush and to direct the Secretary of the Treasury to issue bullion coins during 2019 in honor of Barbara Bush.

S. 514

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 514, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the benefits and services provided by the Department of Veterans Affairs to women veterans, and for other purposes.

S. 525

At the request of Mr. PAUL, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 525, a bill to preserve and protect the free choice of individual employees to form, join, or assist labor organizations, or to refrain from such activities.

S. 595

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 595, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the coordination of programs to prevent and treat obesity, and for other purposes.

S. 743

At the request of Mr. ISAKSON, the names of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY), the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 743, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the soldiers of the 5307th Composite Unit (Provisional), commonly known as "Merrill's Marauders", in recognition of their bravery and outstanding service in the jungles of Burma during World War II.

S. 846

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 846, a bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to limit certain rolling stock procurements, and for other purposes.

S. 866

At the request of Mr. VAN HOLLEN, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 866, a bill to amend part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act to provide full Federal funding of such part.

S. 879

At the request of Mr. VAN HOLLEN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 879, a bill to provide a process for granting lawful permanent resident status to aliens from certain countries who meet specified eligibility requirements, and for other purposes.

S. 890

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr.

MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 890, a bill to authorize the Sergeant at Arms to protect the personal technology devices and accounts of Senators and covered employees from cyber attacks and hostile information collection activities, and for other purposes.

S. 933

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 933, a bill to improve data collection and monitoring of the Great Lakes, oceans, bays, estuaries, and coasts, and for other purposes.

S. 1172

At the request of Mr. VAN HOLLEN, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1172, a bill to require full funding of part A of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

S. 1268

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1268, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure that hospitals receive adequate payment for the acquisition of hematopoietic stem cells under the Medicare program, and for other purposes.

S. 1399

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1399, a bill to amend title VIII of the Public Health Services Act to revise and extend nursing workforce development programs.

S. 1583

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1583, a bill to amend the Lead-Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act to provide for additional procedures for families with children under the age of 6, and for other purposes.

S. 1590

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1590, a bill to amend the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 to authorize rewards for thwarting wildlife trafficking linked to transnational organized crime, and for other purposes.

S. 1675

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1675, a bill to impose requirements on the payment of compensation to professional persons employed in voluntary cases commenced under title III of PROMESA.

S. 1757

At the request of Ms. ERNST, the names of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr.

BARRASSO), the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL), and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) were added as cosponsors of S. 1757, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the United States Army Rangers Veterans of World War II in recognition of their extraordinary service during World War II.

S. 1804

At the request of Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1804, a bill to require the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to issue guidelines relating to the appropriate inclusion of residential manufactured homes in Consolidated Plans, and for other purposes.

S. 1820

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1820, a bill to improve the integrity and safety of horseracing by requiring a uniform anti-doping and medication control program to be developed and enforced by an independent Horseracing Anti-Doping and Medication Control Authority.

S. 1838

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1838, a bill to amend the Hong Kong Policy Act of 1992, and for other purposes.

S. 1908

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1908, a bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to improve the efficiency of summer meals.

S. 2054

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Ms. ERNST) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2054, a bill to posthumously award the Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to Glen Doherty, Tyrone Woods, J. Christopher Stevens, and Sean Smith, in recognition of their contributions to the Nation.

S. 2085

At the request of Ms. ROSEN, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2085, a bill to authorize the Secretary of Education to award grants to eligible entities to carry out educational programs about the Holocaust, and for other purposes.

S. 2216

At the request of Mr. PETERS, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2216, a bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to formally recognize caregivers of veterans, notify veterans and caregivers of clinical determinations relating to eligibility for caregiver programs, and temporarily extend benefits for veterans who are determined ineligible for the

family caregiver program, and for other purposes.

S. 2327

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2327, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to modify the eligibility requirements for transfer of unused entitlement to Post-9/11 Educational Assistance, and for other purposes.

S. 2330

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the names of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) and the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) were added as cosponsors of S. 2330, a bill to amend the Ted Stevens Olympic and Amateur Sports Act to provide for congressional oversight of the board of directors of the United States Olympic and Paralympic Committee and to protect amateur athletes from emotional, physical, and sexual abuse, and for other purposes.

S. 2346

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the name of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2346, a bill to improve the Fishery Resource Disaster Relief program of the National Marine Fisheries Service, and for other purposes.

S. 2417

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2417, a bill to provide for payment of proceeds from savings bonds to a State with title to such bonds pursuant to the judgment of a court.

S. 2473

At the request of Mr. ISAKSON, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2473, a bill to extend certain provisions of the Caribbean Basin Economic Recovery Act until September 30, 2030, and for other purposes.

S. 2541

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2541, a bill to amend the Indian Health Care Improvement Act to authorize advance appropriations for the Indian Health Service by providing 2-fiscal-year budget authority, and for other purposes.

S. 2546

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2546, a bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to require a group health plan or health insurance coverage offered in connection with such a plan to provide an exceptions process for any medication step therapy protocol, and for other purposes.

S. 2602

At the request of Mr. BURR, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr.

PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2602, a bill to exclude vehicles to be used solely for competition from certain provisions of the Clean Air Act, and for other purposes.

S. 2615

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the names of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2615, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to improve the historic rehabilitation tax credit, and for other purposes.

S. 2630

At the request of Mr. LEE, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2630, a bill to repeal the wage requirements of the Davis-Bacon Act.

S. 2638

At the request of Ms. DUCKWORTH, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2638, a bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to require small hub airports to construct areas for nursing mothers, and for other purposes.

S. 2671

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2671, a bill to build safer, thriving communities, and save lives by investing in effective violence reduction initiatives.

S. 2703

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2703, a bill to enhance the recognition of, and response to, aircraft failure conditions, and for other purposes.

S. 2745

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. HAWLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2745, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit discrimination by abortion against an unborn child on the basis of Down syndrome.

S. 2764

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2764, a bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to clarify how controlled substance analogues that are imported or offered for import are to be regulated, and for other purposes.

S. 2765

At the request of Mr. ENZI, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2765, a bill to improve Federal fiscal controls and the congressional budget process.

S. 2787

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2787, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require report-

ing for qualified opportunity funds, to make modifications to opportunity zones, and for other purposes.

S. 2794

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2794, a bill to provide for the creation of the Missing Armed Forces Personnel Records Collection at the National Archives, to require the expeditious public transmission to the Archivist and public disclosure of Missing Armed Forces Personnel records, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 98

At the request of Mrs. BLACKBURN, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 98, a resolution establishing the Congressional Gold Star Family Fellowship Program for the placement in offices of Senators of children, spouses, and siblings of members of the Armed Forces who are hostile casualties or who have died from a training-related injury.

S. RES. 150

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) and the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 150, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that it is the policy of the United States to commemorate the Armenian Genocide through official recognition and remembrance.

S. RES. 371

At the request of Mr. COONS, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 371, a resolution reaffirming the support of the United States for the people of the Republic of South Sudan and calling on all parties to uphold their commitments to peace and dialogue as outlined in the 2018 revitalized peace agreement.

S. RES. 395

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 395, a resolution recognizing the 40th anniversary of the Iran Hostage Crisis, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. ISAKSON, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BRAUN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 395, *supra*.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. WARREN, Mr. KING, Mr. MERKLEY, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 2837. A bill to amend title 51, United States Code, to require a National Aeronautics and Space Administration initiative on reduction of greenhouse gas emissions and noise emissions from aircraft, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, today, I am pleased to introduce new legislation called the Cleaner, Quieter Airplanes Act. This legislation sets an ambitious goal for accelerating the National Aeronautics & Space Administration's (NASA) important, ongoing work on electric aircraft propulsion and other technologies to be integrated on new aircraft that are both cleaner and quieter. It challenges us to bring about a transformational shift in our aviation industry to airplanes that produce less greenhouse gas pollution and less noise: 50 percent less by 2030 for regional transport aircraft and by 2040 for larger aircraft serving transcontinental markets.

To achieve this goal, this bill proposes \$1.2 billion in funding for NASA over six years, with a ramp-up and then a decline in the annual amounts. This funding will push NASA to accelerate its work and to expand its collaboration with industry partners to get this done.

A growing number of Maryland citizens have expressed concerns about airplane noise in their communities. We all want a thriving aviation industry. Air travel is important to our way of life, and it is a key sector of our economy, accounting for more than 5 percent of our total gross domestic product (GDP) in 2014 and supporting more than 10 million jobs.

As air traffic volumes increase, however, we are increasing our communities' exposure to noise pollution that has an adverse impact on our quality of life. We need to find new solutions for supporting our need for air travel while addressing these concerns about noise.

This legislation is also about finding new and innovative ways to fight climate change. Today, transportation is the leading source of greenhouse gas emissions in the United States. Aviation accounts for approximately 3 percent of all emissions. Three percent may not sound like much, but consider that emissions from aviation are expected to triple by 2050 and could account for as much as 25 percent of global emissions. If we want to continue flying as we do now while protecting ourselves from the perils of climate change, now is the time to act.

There is some exciting innovation happening right now, with companies working on new, electric aircraft technologies—including work by large, established companies and by smaller start-ups. We have heard from some of them, and two things they have said stand out.

The first is that government-funded research undertaken by NASA is critical to the development and testing of new technologies in electric aircraft. The work that NASA does in collaboration with industry partners addresses a wide array of technical challenges, like how to make certain electrical components work at high altitudes and what sorts of air frame designs might best enable new kinds of propulsion.

The second thing we hear is that if we do not act with greater urgency, we

risk allowing other countries to pass us by in a critical industry. Europe, in particular, is moving quickly with strong government investments in research, development, and demonstration of new, electric aircraft technologies.

If we fail to match this ambition and build these skills at home, we will be left out of this drive to innovate and our businesses and workers will be at a competitive disadvantage. This will become even more difficult as other countries embrace new, stricter standards for aircraft noise and greenhouse gas pollution.

So there are a few reasons for the urgency behind this legislation. It responds to the need to support research and development in our aviation industry to remain competitive with other countries. It responds to the need for new ideas to combat climate change. And it responds to our need for air travel with fewer noise impacts on our neighborhoods. This legislation calls on our innovative spirit to produce a new generation of airplanes that are cleaner, quieter, and ultimately more sustainable, both for our environment and our economy.

Thank you.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 417—COMMEMORATING THE 81ST ANNIVERSARY OF KRISTALLNACHT, OR THE NIGHT OF BROKEN GLASS

Mr. MURPHY submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 417

Whereas November 9, 2019, through November 10, 2019, marks the 81st anniversary of Kristallnacht, or the Night of Broken Glass;

Whereas Kristallnacht began as a pogrom authorized by Nazi party officials and was carried out by members of the Sturmabteilungen (commonly known as the "SA"), the Schutzstaffel (commonly known as the "SS"), and the Hitler Youth;

Whereas Kristallnacht marked the first large-scale anti-Semitic operation of the Nazi Party and a crucial turning point in Nazi anti-Semitic policy;

Whereas, during Kristallnacht, synagogues, homes, and businesses in Jewish communities were attacked, resulting in murders and arrests of Jewish people in Germany and in Austrian and Czechoslovakian territories controlled by the Nazis;

Whereas the events of Kristallnacht resulted in the burning and destruction of 267 synagogues, the looting of thousands of businesses and homes, the desecration of Jewish cemeteries, the murder of 91 Jews, and the arrest and deportation of 30,000 Jewish men to concentration camps;

Whereas the shards of broken glass from the windows of synagogues, Jewish homes, and Jewish-owned businesses ransacked during the violence that littered the streets gave the pogrom the name of Kristallnacht, commonly translated as the "Night of Broken Glass";

Whereas Kristallnacht—

(1) proved to be a crucial turning point in the Holocaust, marking a shift from a policy of removing Jews from Germany and German-occupied lands to murdering millions of people; and

(2) was a tragic precursor to the Second World War;

Whereas, despite numerous global efforts to eradicate hate, manifestations of anti-Semitism and other forms of intolerance continue to harm societies on a global scale; and

Whereas, in 2018—

(1) anti-Semitic acts in France increased by more than 70 percent compared to the previous year, according to data from the Government of France; and

(2) anti-Semitic crimes in Germany, which include hate speech, increased by 20 percent, according to data from the Government of Germany;

Whereas, because hate crimes in the European Union are generally under reported, the real figures on anti-Semitism in France, Germany, and other states in the European Union are likely much higher;

Whereas, while the United States has made progress towards addressing anti-Semitism, recent events demonstrate that much work remains;

Whereas, in 2017, the Anti-Defamation League recorded 1,986 anti-Semitic incidents across the United States, including physical assaults, vandalism, and attacks on Jewish institutions, which represents a 57 percent increase compared to anti-Semitic incidents recorded in 2016;

Whereas recent anti-Semitic acts in the United States include—

(1) the shooting at the Tree of Life Synagogue in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, in October, 2018; and

(2) the shooting at the Chabad of Poway Synagogue in Poway, California, in April, 2019;

Whereas, according to the Anti-Defamation League, since the Tree of Life Shooting occurred, at least 13 white supremacists have been arrested for their alleged roles in terrorist plots, attacks, or threats against the Jewish community in the United States; and

Whereas Kristallnacht teaches mankind how hate can proliferate and erode societies and serves as a reminder that the United States must advance global efforts to ensure that barbarism and mass murder never occur again: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the 81st anniversary of Kristallnacht;

(2) pays tribute to the more than 6,000,000 Jewish people killed during the Holocaust and the families affected by the tragedy;

(3) continues to support United States efforts to address the horrible legacy of the Holocaust and combat manifestations of anti-Semitism domestically and globally; and

(4) will continue to raise awareness and act to eradicate the continuing scourge of anti-Semitism at home and abroad, including through work with international partners, such as—

(A) the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (referred to in this resolving clause as the "OSCE");

(B) the Tolerance and Non-Discrimination Unit of the OSCE; and

(C) the Personal Representative on Combating Anti-Semitism of the OSCE.

SENATE RESOLUTION 418—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING THE GOVERNMENT OF TURKEY'S CRACKDOWN ON DISSENT RELATED TO ITS INCURSION INTO NORTHEAST SYRIA, AND BROADER HUMAN RIGHTS VIOLATIONS

Mrs. BLACKBURN (for herself, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. Kaine, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. RUBIO, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 418

Whereas Turkey is a constitutional, secular state with an ethnically, religiously, and culturally diverse population;

Whereas Turkey has been a modern democracy and a major North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) ally to the United States;

Whereas Turkey is a signatory to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and is therefore obligated to uphold the freedom of its people to peacefully express criticism of their government;

Whereas, immediately following the incursion by the Turkish Armed Forces into northeast Syria on October 9, 2019, the Government of Turkey began a coordinated crackdown on online dissent;

Whereas, on October 9, 2019, Turkey's National Security Directorate made a statement that criminal investigations had been initiated against 78 people for "inciting enmity and hatred through black propaganda [smear campaign] against [Turkey] over Operation Peace Spring; sharing unsourced and false social media postings intended to destroy the reputation of [Turkey's] security forces and making propaganda for a terrorist organization";

Whereas expression of opposition views through social media posts, social media reposts, and shared online articles has led to the investigation and detention of individuals in the region;

Whereas the shared content targeted by Turkish authorities was largely authored by Western and United States sources and outlets;

Whereas Turkey has over 120 journalists and media workers in jail, more than in any other country, with most of them detained under propaganda charges;

Whereas, on October 10, 2019, the digital services manager of the Birgun daily newspaper was detained in his home in Istanbul and questioned in relation to a news article and a tweet said to have incited enmity or hatred under the Article 216/1 of Turkish Penal Code;

Whereas, on October 11, 2019, Minister of the Interior Suleyman Soylu stated during a speech that 121 people had been detained for their social media posts "insulting 'Operation Peace Spring', describing [our] country as an invader and insulating the unity of our nation";

Whereas, on October 14, 2019, military police carried out a countrywide operation with the aim of "preventing and deterring sympathizers of the terrorist organization from [engaging in provocations related to] Operation Peace Spring" in which over 500,000 people were interrogated and 152 people were detained, according to Amnesty International;

Whereas, as of October 16, 2019, authorities have identified 839 social media accounts under investigation, and 186 individuals taken into police custody since October 9, 2019, related to "shared criminal content";

Whereas, on October 19, 2019, police raided several homes of human rights defenders and journalists on counts of "inciting enmity or hatred" through social media posts;

Whereas, on October 25, 2019, criminal complaints were made against the French weekly journal *Le Point* for its coverage of the military offensive;

Whereas the style and scale of the social media crackdown specific to Turkish operations in Syria has recent precedent in the aftermath of the Turkish Armed Forces' Operation Olive Branch in Afrin, in which—

(1) 1,719 social media accounts were investigated;

(2) 845 people were detained for social media posts; and

(3) 643 people were subject to judicial proceedings; including 11 physician members of the Turkish Medical Association's Central Council, who were sentenced to terms up to 3 years and three months for calling to an end to the Afrin military operation;

Whereas Turkish authorities have targeted more than a thousand criminal defense lawyers as part of the ongoing crackdown on dissent;

Whereas more than 265 academics have been prosecuted in Turkey for signing an appeal for peace between the Government of Turkey and Kurdish insurgents;

Whereas human rights violations have been a defining aspect of President Erdogan's authoritarian rule, including—

(1) the removal of at least 88 of the pro-Kurdish Peoples' Democratic Party (HDP) mayors from office in the last three years and their replacement with state-appointed trustees;

(2) the detention of HDP members of parliament; and

(3) the detention of Turkish employees of United States diplomatic facilities in Turkey;

Whereas blanket bans on peaceful protests of any form have been implemented by local governors across Turkey; and

Whereas these bans have resulted in the arrest and detention of many people and represent clear violations to the right to peaceful assembly as protected by international human rights conventions to which Turkey is a party and by the Constitution of Turkey; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) reaffirms the position of the United States that peaceful dissent should be protected under the right of freedom of expression in Turkey;

(2) condemns policies and efforts by the Government of Turkey to suppress peaceful protesters, including those expressing dissent against military operations by the Turkish Armed Forces or policies instituted by the Government of Turkey;

(3) stands with the defenders of free speech and human rights in Turkey;

(4) encourages senior United States administration officials to raise the issue of suppression of free speech and media in Turkey at the highest levels, both bilaterally and multilaterally;

(5) encourages United States embassy and consular staff to attend politically motivated trials; and

(6) calls on the Government of Turkey to—
(A) immediately lift restrictions on freedom of expression, including expression online or in social media;

(B) ensure that criticism of the Turkish Armed Forces' military operations or calling for peace—through media, social media, peaceful assembly, or other peaceful means—is not criminalized;

(C) drop all charges and end prosecution of individuals or groups for peaceful expression of their opposition to Turkey's military operations in Syria;

(D) ensure that people can gather and protest peacefully, including by lifting blanket protest bans across the country;

(E) release all political prisoners, including journalists and Turkish employees of United States diplomatic missions; and

(F) respect the rights of Turkish citizens to elect their leaders through a democratic process.

SENATE RESOLUTION 419—PERMITTING THE COLLECTION OF CLOTHING, TOYS, FOOD, AND HOUSEWARES DURING THE HOLIDAY SEASON FOR CHARITABLE PURPOSES IN SENATE BUILDINGS

Mr. TESTER (for himself and Mr. ISAKSON) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 419

Resolved,

SECTION 1. COLLECTION OF CLOTHING, TOYS, FOOD, AND HOUSEWARES DURING THE HOLIDAY SEASON FOR CHARITABLE PURPOSES IN SENATE BUILDINGS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of the rules or regulations of the Senate—

(1) a Senator, officer of the Senate, or employee of the Senate may collect from another Senator, officer of the Senate, or employee of the Senate within a Senate building or other office secured for a Senator non-monetary donations of clothing, toys, food, and housewares for charitable purposes related to serving persons in need or members of the Armed Forces and the families of those members during the holiday season, if the charitable purposes do not otherwise violate any rule or regulation of the Senate or Federal law; and

(2) a Senator, officer of the Senate, or employee of the Senate may work with a non-profit organization with respect to the delivery of donations described under paragraph (1).

(b) EXPIRATION.—The authority provided by this resolution shall expire at the end of the first session of the 116th Congress.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 1244. Mr. INHOFE (for Mr. BLUNT) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 1865, to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint a coin in commemoration of the opening of the National Law Enforcement Museum in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 1244. Mr. INHOFE (for Mr. BLUNT) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 1865, to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint a coin in commemoration of the opening of the National Law Enforcement Museum in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

SEC. 9. FINANCIAL ASSURANCES.

The Secretary shall take such actions as may be necessary to ensure that—

(1) minting and issuing coins under this Act will not result in any net cost to the United States Government; and

(2) no funds, including applicable surcharges, are disbursed to any recipient designated in section 7 until the total cost of

designing and issuing all of the coins authorized by this Act (including labor, materials, dies, use of machinery, overhead expenses, marketing, and shipping) is recovered by the United States Treasury, consistent with sections 5112(m) and 5134(f) of title 31, United States Code.

NATIONAL LAW ENFORCEMENT MUSEUM COMMEMORATIVE COIN ACT

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 1865, which was received from the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1865) to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint a coin in commemoration of the opening of the National Law Enforcement Museum in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. INHOFE. I ask unanimous consent that the Blunt amendment at the desk be considered and agreed to; that the bill, as amended be considered read a third time and passed; and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 1244) was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: To add a provision relating to financial assurances)

At the end, add the following:

SEC. 9. FINANCIAL ASSURANCES.

The Secretary shall take such actions as may be necessary to ensure that—

(1) minting and issuing coins under this Act will not result in any net cost to the United States Government; and

(2) no funds, including applicable surcharges, are disbursed to any recipient designated in section 7 until the total cost of designing and issuing all of the coins authorized by this Act (including labor, materials, dies, use of machinery, overhead expenses, marketing, and shipping) is recovered by the United States Treasury, consistent with sections 5112(m) and 5134(f) of title 31, United States Code.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The bill (H.R. 1865), as amended, was passed.

PERMITTING THE COLLECTION OF CLOTHING, TOYS, FOOD, AND HOUSEWARES DURING THE HOLIDAY SEASON FOR CHARITABLE PURPOSES IN SENATE BUILDINGS

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 419, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 419) permitting the collection of clothing, toys, food, and housewares during the holiday season for charitable purposes in Senate buildings.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to proceeding to the measure?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. INHOFE. I further ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 419) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—S. 2731

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate's action placing S. 2731 on the Calendar be vitiated and the bill be considered introduced and held at the desk on October 29, 2019, and then indefinitely postponed today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—S. 2840

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, I understand there is a bill at the desk, and I ask for its first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the title of the bill for the first time.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2840) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, and for other purposes.

Mr. INHOFE. I now ask for a second reading and in order to place the bill on the Calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I object to my own request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the bill will be read for the second time on the next legislative day.

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 13, 2019

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m., Wednesday, November 13; further, that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, morning business

be closed, and the Senate proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the Wolf nomination, with the postclosure time expiring at 11 a.m.; further, that if confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action; finally, that the Senate recess from 12:30 p.m. until 2 p.m. to allow for the conference meetings.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order, following the remarks of Senator MENENDEZ.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Madam President, first, let me congratulate the Senator from Oklahoma on his upcoming 50th anniversary.

Mr. INHOFE. 60th.

Mr. MENENDEZ. That is the 60th anniversary. Oh, my God. That is a hallmark under any set of circumstances, and we wish him much health and happiness with his bride for a lot longer time as well. I say congratulations.

Mr. INHOFE. Thank you.

TURKEY AND SYRIA

Mr. MENENDEZ. Madam President, When President Trump welcomes Turkish President Erdogan to the White House this week, he will be welcoming a known authoritarian, human rights abuser, and friend to Putin, whose behavior increasingly runs counter to the interests of the United States and our allies. It is yet another strategic mistake and a terrible misuse of the power of the Presidency.

In recent years, the President of Turkey has made a series of decisions to part ways with NATO, with the United States, and with the basic principles of democracy. Make no mistake. Erdogan's actions are intentional. It is stunning to think that any American President would legitimize Erdogan's harmful policies by welcoming him to the Oval Office. This meeting is a mistake, plain and simple.

I can only hope that instead of yielding to Erdogan's policies that are so squarely at odds with U.S. interests, President Trump treats this misguided meeting as more than just a photo op with yet another dictator.

The President should instead use this visit to actually stand up for America, for our principles, and for our allies. He can do this by raising the many serious questions that Turkey has yet to address.

I would like to use this opportunity to outline 10 critical questions, each of which deserves real answers.

Question No. 1: Will Turkey reverse course from Erdogan's decision to buy

and receive the S-400 air defense system from Russia?

The President's National Security Advisor claims that the administration is very "upset" about Turkey's purchase of Russia's S-400 weapons system. Well, "upset" is not a policy, and it falls well short of the Trump administration's legal obligations.

Under the CAATSA sanctions law, Turkey's purchase of the S-400 is a significant and sanctionable transaction. These sanctions should have been imposed in July when Turkey first took delivery of the S-400s. Yet, by failing to implement the legal requirements of CAATSA, President Trump has done lasting damage to U.S. credibility, to the integrity of our sanctions, and to the rule of law.

Is it too much to ask the President of the United States to follow the law?

He can start by imposing CAATSA sanctions when Erdogan is in Washington.

Question Number 2: Will our President sanction the activities of Halkbank, a Turkish institution that facilitated the biggest evasion of Iran's sanctions in history? I repeat: It was the biggest evasion of Iran sanctions in history.

We know that the Justice Department has finally brought charges in the case, but if the administration had followed the law, they would have already imposed sanctions on Halkbank and sent a message to other actors who seek to evade Iran sanctions.

I understand that one of Erdogan's top priorities for his visit to the White House is to secure relief for Halkbank. That is the opposite of what the law requires, and I hope President Trump shows some backbone when Erdogan asks him for yet another favor.

Let's not forget that President Trump's personal attorney, Rudy Giuliani represented Reza Zarrab, one of the players in Halkbank's sanctions evasion.

It seems that the President likes to talk tough about his sanctions policy on Iran and yet all the tough talks suddenly stops when the interests of his authoritarian pals or his personal lawyer are on the line.

Question number 3: Will the President accept the commission of war crimes in Syria by Turkish-backed forces—the war crimes that he in effect invited Turkey to commit when he green-lighted its invasion of Syria?

The U.N. reports that more than 200,000 people have been internally displaced from the so-called safe zone controlled by the Turks. Some of those displaced have reported that Turkish-backed forces have beaten civilians and conducted kidnappings and summary executions.

With the pullout of American troops, Turkey was effectively given license to commit these abuses and unleash unspeakable crimes. That is ethnic cleansing.

So many in this Chamber have said never again to this kind of horror in

the past. Can we depend on President Trump to do the same?

Last week, I introduced a binding resolution that would require the State Department to report on Turkish human rights abuses in Syria. State's findings could have a direct bearing on arms sales to Turkey. Meanwhile, we have additional legislation to hold Turkey accountable that has been waiting for a vote for weeks.

But where are we? Did we pass the Risch-Menendez bill on Turkey? No. Did we pass the House version of that legislation? No. Day after day, week after week, we sit on our hands, too timid to act on any legislation that might upset Erdogan while he is in town. Whatever happened to standing up for our American values?

This weekend, National Security Advisor Robert O'Brien declared that "there's no place for ethnic cleansing, for war crimes in the 21st century." Will President Trump deliver that message to Erdogan on Wednesday? Will he seek to maintain any shred of dignity and U.S. credibility on human rights issues, or will he let Erdogan engage in these horrific human rights issues without consequence?

Question Number 4: Will our President stand up to Turkish aggression against its neighbors throughout the region? Turkish naval ships routinely violate the exclusive economic zones of Cyprus and may take measures in Famagusta that would set the peace process on the island back even further.

Turkey also routinely violates airspace that belongs to Greece, brazenly disregarding Greece's sovereignty and the safety of Greek pilots and those on the ground below.

Has President Trump uttered a word of support for our Greek friends and NATO ally? Will he affirm America's relationship with Greece during Erdogan's visit to the White House?

The EU has developed a sanctions framework that would address Turkey's actions in the Cypriot Exclusive Economic Zone. Will Donald Trump follow suit?

Question No. 5: Will our President condemn or accept Erdogan's warming relationship with the Russian Federation?

In addition to buying the S-400, Turkey is now in talks to purchase the Russian Sukhoi aircraft. Last week, Erdogan felt the need to coordinate with President Putin prior to coming to the United States. According to Reuters, he said he would hold a phone call with the Russian President over the weekend to "form the basis" of his talks with President Trump.

Imagine this, a NATO ally—NATO comprised primarily to defend against the Russian Federation—a NATO ally going to have conversations with Putin to form the basis of his conversation with President Trump. Aside from perhaps Hungary, I can't imagine any other leader in NATO coordinating with Putin before a conversation with an American President.

Some say we need to tread carefully with Turkey lest we push it into Russia's arms. Push? It seems to me that Erdogan has jumped into Putin's arms long ago with no provocation from us.

Question No. 6: Will President Trump call out Erdogan's assault on the democratic process in Turkey? Will he stick up for civil society groups, university professors, and others who have been unjustly detained? Will he stick up for journalists there, even as he demonizes the free press here at home? More journalists are imprisoned in Turkey than any other country in the world—in the world.

Under article 2 of the NATO charter, member countries commit to a certain set of democratic principles. This is the basis of the alliance. At its core, this is why we commit to the mutual defense of these allies. They share our values, our belief in human rights, in human freedom, in democracy, and in the rule of law. Yet all of Erdogan's actions over the past few years run afoul of the democratic principles that define the NATO alliance.

I know the President does not like to stand up for democracy at home or abroad, but I hope this meeting will be different in that he will finally come to understand what was clear to so many Presidents before him—Republican and Democratic alike—that how a leader treats his own people is indicative of how they will act on the world stage. An authoritarian at home is an authoritarian abroad, and both should matter to the United States.

Question No. 7: Will President Trump ignore the violent attacks by Erdogan's security detail in 2017 against peaceful protesters and DC police? The last time Erdogan visited in 2017, his goons did just that, resulting in criminal charges against more than half a dozen members of his security detail.

During his meeting, President Trump should insist that Erdogan hand over those guards implicated in the 2017 attacks. It is clear that Erdogan's visit will again attract demonstrators and rightfully so. While Erdogan may not believe in the right of peaceful protest in his home country, I hope Erdogan learned his lesson that here in the United States the right to peaceful assembly is enshrined in our Constitution and is core to our democracy. I hope President Trump clearly reminds him of this fact.

Question No. 8: Will President Trump accept efforts by Turkey to convert Hagia Sophia, which was the largest Greek Orthodox Church in the world for more than 1,000 years, into a mosque? Will he advocate for the religious freedom of the Ecumenical Patriarch Bartholomew, who continues to work and live under pressure from the Turkish Government? I hear a lot about religious freedom. Well, this is one glaring example where the administration has been silent.

Question No. 9: Will President Trump ignore Erdogan's violation of the U.N.'s

arms embargo on Libya? Now, to be fair, Turkey is not the only country funneling weapons to clients in Libya in clear violation of U.N. Security Council Resolution 1970, but the grinding, protracted conflict heightened by these weapons is destabilizing North Africa and allowing for the trafficking and exploitation of desperate migrants and refugees.

Will President Trump call on all outside powers, including Turkey, to engage in Libya with diplomacy rather than weapons transfers and to encourage the warring parties to find a political solution to the conflict?

Finally, Question No. 10: Will President Trump call out Turkey's relationship with Hamas, the Palestinian organization that continues to terrorize Israel on a daily basis? Will he stand by our ally Israel or will his personal interest and affinity for strong men win out once again?

The President says he wants to put America first. Yet on every one of these 10 issues, the President has cowered to the demands of Ankara and Moscow.

Look, President Trump can meet with Erdogan—that is his decision and his prerogative—but on these and so many other issues, President Trump's actions do not represent the values of the American people or their representatives in Congress. He does not represent those who support holding Russia accountable. He does not represent those who stand against war crimes in Syria. He does not represent those who want to see a democratic Turkey.

Despite our objections, President Trump will welcome Erdogan to the Oval Office. At the same time, it is worth pointing out that so many months into the controversy surrounding Ukraine, President Trump has yet to set a date for an Oval Office meeting with Ukraine's President Zelensky.

President Zelensky is a true friend to the United States on the frontlines of the struggle for democracy in his country. He is standing up to Russian aggression and corruption. He is respecting the free press. He is working to strengthen democratic institutions. President Zelensky is everything that President Erdogan of Turkey is not. Yet it is Turkey that President Trump continues to admire and Ukraine that he continues to demonize.

Something is wrong here. Something is wrong. We should not have to cross our fingers and hope that any American President stands up for our values, holds our adversaries accountable, and does the right thing when it matters most. It should not be a question. It should be a given. Yet all I can do at this time is hope that President Trump

will reverse course and challenge the bad behavior of an authoritarian like Erdogan rather than celebrate it.

With that, I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands adjourned until 10 a.m. tomorrow.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 7:01 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, November 13, 2019, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12212:

To be colonel

THOMAS JASON ABELL
MAURICIA P. ALO
KEVIN D. ALONS
SOTERA L. ANDERSON
ROBERT P. ANDREWS
WILLIAM B. ANNIE
DAMON B. ARMITAGE
JENNIFER LEE ARMSTRONG
RYAN DOYLE AYERS
DOUGLAS H. BAILEY
CLAY M. BALDWIN
SEAN P. BARNETT
YAAKOV BRUHAIL BINDELL
JASSEN L. BLUTO
WILLIAM R. BOHNSTEDT
EDWARD F. BORNEO
ANTHONY STEPHEN BRADLEY
CLARK J. BRAMANTE
PATRICK LEE BROWN
BRIAN JAMES BUDDEN
FRANCIS X. BUSER
JESSE RYAN CARLSON
KYLE JOHN CERFOGLIO
DAVID ROY CHAUVIN
CHRISTOPHER JOHN CHERNEY
SHAWN M. CLINE
RALPH S. COLEMAN, JR.
MANUEL ANGEL COLON-DEJESUS
EDWARD WARREN COOK, JR.
LOUIS A. DAVENPORT
CHRISTOPHER R. DINOTE
TODD HENRY DOMACHOWSKI
ENRIQUE DOVALO, JR.
NATHAN O. DREWRY
ROBERT EDWARD DRISCOLL, JR.
CHRISTOPHER A. EASON
MANSOUR GEORGE ELHIHI
ERIC NILS ERICKSON, JR.
BRANDON WREGG ESKAM
AMANDA B. EVANS
CHARLES R. EWINGS III
KATHLEEN ANN FALLIS
CHRISTOPHER ALLEN FIELDS
DOUGLAS JAY FIKE
JEREMY RICHARD FORD
TERESA RENEE FRANK
MATTHEW WARD GALLEGOS
JUAN CARLOS GARCIA
SHELDON MCLANE GARDNER
JOSEPH PATRICK GEANEY
KRISTOPHER R. GEIS
GRACE ANN GIBBS
FRED GINSBURG
DANIEL W. GOWDER
NATHAN EDWARD GRABER
JULIE ANN GRATTON
MARK C. HANSEN
RYAN NATHANIEL HARRIS
JASON LEE HAWK
TIMOTHY BLANE HAYNES
MICHAEL W. HOLDCROFT
CHAD ERIC HOLESKO
STEVEN J. HUNTER
NICOLE ANNE IVERS
EDWARD WORTH KELLER III
LISA KIRK
MICHAEL B. KOSDERKA
AMY P. KREMSER
JASON J. LABANT

JEREMY CHRISTOPHER LASITER
WILLIAM J. LAYTON
KRISTY JO LEASMAN
TODD A. LUCE
AARON J. MATHENA
GLENDA M. MATHURINLEE
BRIAN S. MCCULLOUGH
MATTHEW RICHARD MCDONOUGH
MATTHEW J. MCGARRY
MICHAEL PATRICK MCGINN
JENNIFER MAMULA MUMME
ROBERT JOSEPH NOVAK, JR.
JODY W. OGLE
BRIAN L. PARKER
ANTHONY JOHN PASQUALE
AERICK GOURLAY PAXTON
JONATHAN TODD PINKARD
ROBERT ALAN PLANTE
TROY DEAN POORMAN
KRISTIAN BRIAN POST
BRANDON J. POWELL
KEVIN S. RAY
CHRISTOPHER TERREN RAYMOND
JAMES TODD REEMAN
WILLIAM ROBERT ROCHE
MATTHEW PARRISH SANDS
MARC ANTHONY SCORSONE
KRISTOF K. SILLS
BEVERLEY ANN SIMPSON
JACOB P. SKUGRUD
STEVEN JON SMART
JONATHAN T. SMIES
JEFFREY W. SMITH II
SKY W. SMITH
EDWARD MICHAEL SOTO
DAVID J. SPISSO II
TIMOTHY PAUL STANLEY
GLENN HIGHTOWER STEPHENS
JESSICA Y. SULLIVAN
KELLY CALHOUN SULLIVAN
DARCY DELPHON TATE
JON M. TAYLOR
FREDRICK H. THOMAS II
BRET A. TRIPPEL
EDWIN EUGENE TUHY, JR.
ANDREW J. VANDERZIEL
RICHARD GRAHAM VOGT
JAMES BRIAN VOGUS
CHARLES B. WARREN
BART MAYNARD WILDER
JOE FORREST WILDMAN
WILLIAM JENNINGS WILKINSON
AARON THOMAS WILSON
KEITH CHARLES WILSON
DANIEL C. WRAZIEN
KERBY JOHN WRIGHT
BRYAN DOUGLAS YATES
LAWRENCE NAHNO YAZZIE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be major

JOSHUA B. STIERWALT

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

GERALD J. HALL

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

NICOLE L. KRUSE

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be captain

THOMAS Q. GALLAGHER

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 1211:

To be captain

EMMA R. SHINN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR TEMPORARY APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 8287:

To be major

RYAN J. NOWLIN